1971

Selected factors influencing teachers' desire to participate in educational decision-making and their willingness to assume responsibility for decisions

Daniel Michael Lynch
Iowa State University

Selected factors influencing teachers' desire to participate in educational decision-making and their willingness to assume responsibility for decisions

by

Daniel Michael Lynch

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major Subject: Educational Administration

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Area

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

The educational decision-making process has long been the prerogative of the local board of education. Historically all educational decision-making was vested in a board of education, originally called "selectmen." A law passed in 1826 by the Massachusetts legislature indicated that decision-making was the general purpose of the local school committee (45, p. 14).

> That each town in this commonwealth, shall, at the March or April meeting, choose a School Committee, consisting of not less than five persons, who shall have the general charge and superintendence of all the public schools in said town which are kept through the year, at least once a quarter, for the purpose of making a careful examination, of the same, and to see that the scholars are properly supplied with books; also to inquire into the regulation and discipline of such schools, and the proficience of the scholars therein. . .

The policy formulation function continued to be vested in a board of education until the second half of the eighteenth century. Anderson and Van Dyke (2, p. 21) state:

> During the second half of the Eighteenth Century, mounting enrollments forced towns to organize multiple room secondary schools which required the services of several teachers within one building. As these schools evolved, it became necessary to devise some type of organization for coordinating the instructional services of the entire school. No one on the staff had any real authority except in his own class. Such elementary things as determining the time of opening and closing school, scheduling classes, securing supplies and equipment, taking care of and managing the building and communicating with parents and patrons began to pile up and

> demand so much time that the trustees had to appoint a "head teacher" to perform those duties.

Local boards of education did not delegate decision-making to the "head teacher"; in fact, there seems to be no evidence of any desire on the teacher or principal's part to actively participate in decision-making.

As societal demands upon public schools increased and the task of operating them became more complex, there appeared a new officer, the superintendent of schools. Buffalo, New York, is credited with employing the first superintendent of schools in 1837, and a similar position was established in Louisville, Kentucky, the same year.

School boards, however, did not relinquish their power to formulate the policies by which schools were operated. The superintendent's role was merely to execute the policies of the board. The role of the superintendent in policy formulation was crystalized half a century later, in 1895, when the Draper Report (27, p. 21) recommended complete autonomy for the superintendent in policy formulation.

Although the local superintendent now advises the school board on policy matters, the teacher until recently has had very little opportunity to express himself on school policy. Teachers have seemed content to have their authority limited to their own classrooms. This may have been the result of the following factors: 1) poor training of teachers, 2) the

large percentage of females in the profession, and 3) the refusal of superintendents and boards of education to give any consideration to the rights of teachers to have a voice in policy formulation (4).

Recent demands by teachers and teacher organizations reveal that teachers do desire to become involved in decision-making. In 1969, the NEA Research Division (32, p. 6) polled teachers asking, "Are you as a teacher underinvolved or over-involved in the determination of school policies and procedures?" The results of the poll indicated that teachers want to become more involved. Similarly, in 1969, the ISEA (22, p. 7) conducted a study which revealed that teachers were not involved in policy formulation as much as they would like in at least 137 Iowa school districts.

As a result of the growing demands for teacher participation in decision-making, a term has emerged which reflects this desire: professional negotiations. While the concept of professional negotiations is somewhat broad and its operation quite technical; nevertheless, the right of teachers to become involved in policy formulation is at the core of its purpose. A perusal of related literature reveals that the desire of teachers to participate in decision-making to a greater extent than they have in the past is indeed a reality. It, therefore, behooves educators to investigate the process of teacher participation in decision-making so

that better educational decisions can be made.

Statement of the Problem

The problem under investigation in this study was to determine factors which influence decision-making at three levels of involvement (planning, implementation, evaluation) in selected Iowa public schools. This study also attempted to determine teachers' willingness to assume responsibility for decisions in which they have been involved in the formulation thereof.

Specifically, answers to the following questions were sought:

1) Does the factor of age influence a teacher's desire to participate in decision-making at any or all of the three levels of involvement and also influence a teacher's willingness to assume responsibility for decisions that are made?

2) Does the factor of sex influence a teacher's desire to participate in decision-making at any or all of the three levels of involvement and also influence a teacher's willingness to assume responsibility for decisions that are made?

3) Does the factor of number of years of teaching in a given school system influence a teacher's desire to participate in decision-making at any or all of the three levels of involvement and also influence a teacher's willingness to assume responsibility for decisions that are made?

4) Does the factor of grade level taught influence a teacher's desire to participate in decision-making at any or all of the three levels of involvement and also influence a teacher's willingness to assume responsibility for decisions that are made?

5) Does the factor of number of teachers employed in a given school system influence a teacher's desire to participate in decision-making at any or all of the three levels of involvement and also influence a teacher's willingness to assume responsibility for decisions that are made?

6) Does the factor of a teacher's membership in state and national associations influence his desire to participate in decision-making at any or all of the three levels of involvement and also influence his willingness to assume responsibility for decisions that are made?

7) Does the factor of educational level of a teacher influence his desire to participate in decision-making at any or all of the three levels of involvement and also his willingness to assume responsibility for decisions that are made?

8) Does the factor of recency of educational training influence a teacher's desire to participate in decision-making at any or all of the three levels of involvement and also influence a teacher's willingness to assume responsibility for decisions that are made?

Hypotheses Tested

There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of age and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in planning in educational program policy.

By changing the categorization to each of the following:

A. sex,

B. number of years in a school system,

C. grade level taught,

D. number of teachers within a system,

E. membership in state and national associations,

F. educational level,

G. recency of educational training,

and by changing the criterion to:

1. desire to participate in implementing educational program policy,
2. desire to participate in evaluating educational program policy,
3. willingness to assume responsibility for educational program policy decisions,
4. desire to participate in planning personnel policy,
5. desire to participate in implementing personnel policy,
6. desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy,
7. willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions.

A total of 64 null hypotheses were investigated.

Assumptions

The study was based upon the following assumptions:

1. Teachers do desire to be involved in decision-making in issue areas that affect them.
2. Improved staff morale results when teachers are involved in decision-making.

3. Teachers are more willing to accept and implement decisions when they have been involved in the formulation of the decisions.
4. Teacher participation in decision-making brings about a greater desire on the part of teachers to accomplish goals and purposes of the organization.

Need for the Study

The concept of educational decision-making occupies an important role in American public education. Current literature suggests a desire of teachers to actively participate in school policy formulation. It is imperative that research be conducted so that teacher participation in the decision-making process results in favorable educational decisions.

This study, then, was designed to investigate selected factors which influence decision-making at various levels of involvement and also teachers' willingness to assume responsibility for decisions. The results of this study should be of value to teachers, administrators, and professional organizations.

Definition of Terms

In order to present a clear concept of the topic under investigation, the following operational definitions were made:

Personnel policy - Those school policies which relate to teacher welfare, including salary, evaluation, grievance procedure, dismissal, teacher-load, in-service education, and length and conditions of contract.

Educational program policy - Curriculum policies and their relationship to students including student promotion, grouping, assigning marks, subjects offered, course content, and testing programs.

Planning level - Those activities which involve personnel in educational research, development of goals, objectives, and methods of procedure to be utilized in educational program policy or personnel policy.

Implementation level - The enactment of an educational program policy or personnel policy including utilization of both human and physical resources; the operational stage.

Evaluation level - The analysis, formal and informal, of educational program policy and personnel policy in terms of meeting objectives and purposes.

Delimitations

This study was limited to certified public school teachers employed in community, consolidated, and independent school districts maintaining grade levels of K-12 in Iowa. Private and parochial schools were excluded. The personnel

included in this study were those persons holding teaching positions during the school year 1970-1971. In terms of areas under investigation, the study was limited to two broad areas of educational decision-making: personnel policy and educational program policy at three levels of involvement--planning, implementation, and evaluation.

Sources of Data

Data pertinent to this study were collected by means of a questionnaire designed to measure teachers' responses to numerous hypothetical situations involving the decision-making process.

Organization of the Study

This study was organized into five chapters. Chapter one, the Introduction, relates a statement of the problem, assumptions of the study, need for the study, questions to be answered by the study, sources of information, and delimitations. Chapter two presents a review of related literature. The procedures followed for gathering and treating the data are discussed in chapter three. The fourth chapter includes the Findings, in tabular and discussion form, of the mailed survey. The fifth and final chapter of the study presents a summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature seems to center around three aspects of teacher participation in decision-making and consequently has been arranged in three sections: that which attests to the desire of teachers to participate in decision-making more actively than they have done in the past; that which reflects the reactions of the education community to that desire; and that which reports on actual experiments in democratic decision-making in various schools around the nation.

Teachers' Desire to Participate

That teachers desire a more active role in decision-making is most obvious in the resolutions passed by their own teacher organizations. The following is a resolution prepared for delegate action by the Iowa State Education Association (23, p. 4):

> The I.S.E.A. believes that local professional associations have the professional right and should have the mandatory legal right, through appropriate professional channels and democratically elected representatives including 75 per cent classroom teachers, to negotiate with boards of education in the determination of all educational policies affecting services of teachers.

This resolution is indicative of a desire on the part of teachers to have their say in more varied areas of educational policies, not only at the traditional salary meeting, but in all areas of educational decision-making.

Many studies, such as one conducted by Lester S. Bumbarger (8), document the widespread drive for teacher participation. His study focused upon the disagreement between teachers and administrators concerning the locus for decision-making in the public school, and one of his conclusions is that "in their perceptions of actual decision-making practice, teachers as a group assigned decision responsibility lower in the hierarchical scale for all comparisons than did administrators."

E. D. Archambault (3) attempted to discover and measure differences in the perceptions of school board members, superintendents, principals, and teachers and their desire to participate in the development of school policies. His findings revealed that teachers desire to participate at a higher level than board members, superintendents, and principals see for them in terms of personnel policy (salary, evaluation, grievance procedure, dismissal, teacher load, in-service education, recruitment, length of contract year); educational program policy (student promotion, grouping, assigning marks, subjects offered, class size, course content, and standardized testing programs).

R. B. Carson (10) in a study of teacher participation in three Oregon communities concluded that teachers feel that they should be involved in educational decision-making to a greater extent than they have been.

A more recent study conducted by E. S. Murray (31) in 1969 not only substantiated earlier findings that the majority of public school teachers want a voice in the decision-making process, but also concluded that teachers are willing to assume responsibility for their decisions if they are given a voice in the decision-making process.

Factors that are said to have contributed to this new-found activism are many. The human relations Movement in educational administration shifted the emphasis from scientific management to a more democratic administration, which was generally interpreted to mean the involvement of staff in decision-making. That shift occurred during the decades of the 1940's and 1950's, resulting in a natural growth of teacher sophistication and familiarity with decision-making.

There are also frequent mentions in the literature of the increased professionalism of teachers; the growing number of teachers holding advanced degrees, and the increasing proportion of teachers who view education as a career rather than as a temporary means of adding to the family income or filling in a gap of time until one decided what to do with one's life.

Robert Doherty (13, p. 515) explains the importance of this professionalism on the teachers' desire to help determine school policy by pointing out that:

> . . . one is more inclined to put up with a variety of indignities if one expects to

> resign just as soon as one's romantic, psychological, or economic goals have been reached. The fact that many women teachers don't quit, even after the goals have been realized, seems to have little effect on their expectation of doing so.

Another factor frequently mentioned as a contributor to teacher activism is the increasing proportion of male teachers who are often the sole providers for their families, whereas female teachers composed a majority of most staffs in the past. The male teacher is not only more concerned with salary benefits for obvious reasons, but he is also more aggressive and more able and willing to move to another job if his present working conditions cannot be made satisfactory to him.

Doherty (13, p. 521) stated that the employment of men teachers has risen by 93.3 per cent between the years 1954-55 and 1964-65, as compared to an increase of 37.9 per cent for women.

And the results of the growing proportion of male teachers is interpreted in the same article (13, p. 521):

> Higher salaries have attracted more men to the profession, and with their greater expectation to remain as classroom teachers for the foreseeable future, it seemed to follow that they should become more anxious than women to have a greater control over the conditions under which they worked. It is not surprising that many of them should want these conditions formalized and want to place certain restrictions on the discretionary powers of school boards and administrators.

There is also the factor of the increased bureaucracy in school systems that have been consolidated during the past decades. While there were in the United States 60,000 local school administrative units during the academic year 1954-55, that number was sharply reduced to about 28,000 in the academic year ending in June of 1965. In addition to the consolidation of that period, school enrollments increased from 30 million students to almost 43 million. Thus, while the number of schools declined by almost 50 per cent, school enrollment increased by more than 24 per cent.

Even the most glorified benefits of consolidation cannot belie the fact that the personal and intimate teacher-administrator relations have been virtually impossible to maintain. Whereas the salaries and the duties may have only been fitted to the individual needs of the staff member, now they in many cases must be designed for dozens or even hundreds of teachers instead. The resulting impersonality has resulted in magnifying teachers' dissatisfaction with school policies.

Communication, which was once a reciprocal process between administrator and teacher, has frequently become a one-way process, due to the need for formal bureaucratic procedures. Although the teachers may not expect nor even want the old informal relationships, they do seem to be requesting some of the old authority or at least the old

opportunities to speak their minds, if there ever really were such. Perhaps the only realistic method of doing this is to match the organizational strength of the administration with organizational strength of their own, which in turn brings up another factor that seems to have contributed to teachers' demand for participation in decision-making: growing competition between teachers' organizations to represent teachers.

Although the two major teacher organizations, the NEA (National Education Association) and the AFT (American Federation of Teachers), have been in competition for many years, they seem to have reached the stage of open contests only recently. With a membership approaching 120,000 and a record of winning many representation elections, at least in the metropolitan areas, the AFT can no longer be ignored. The NEA (13, p. 520) has claimed a much broader scope in purposes and "has been brought into collective bargaining reluctantly and awkwardly at first, but presently with a considerable amount of self-generated militancy and no small amount of skill."

This competition of organizations for the privilege of representing teachers results in increased dissatisfaction among teachers. A grievance that might have gone unmentioned before can become an important issue if, for the first time, somebody promises to try to make a change in that area.

Examples of such newly voiced grievances might include duty-free lunch periods for elementary teachers, a duty-free planning period for all teachers, extended use of teacher aides, and a decrease in additional tasks the teacher was once responsible for, such as supervision of extra-curricular activities and clerical work. Desiring a greater voice in educational decision-making, many writers imply, can be included in this list as something that may have never developed beyond the consideration stage except for the wish of the organizations to procure greater rights for their members.

One also is reminded in the literature to consider the balance of supply and demand for teachers during the past decade which has seen the growth of teachers' desire to participate in decision-making. A teacher who has felt that his wishes have not been considered has been able to find another job easily in the 1960's. If jobs had been less plentiful, the same teacher who could have moved on so easily might have been more willing to wait for the changes that would have given him a more active role in decision-making.

Other factors involved in the growing restiveness of teachers may include four recorded by Stinnett, Kleinmann, and Ware (44, p. 5):

1. Increasing bitterness of teachers at the general neglect of schools by an affluent society.

2. The rapid emergence of a new status for public employees in general.

3. The emergence of social and political commitment throughout the world to the end of paternalism and to a new status in dignity.

4. The psychological effects of the activities of the Civil Rights Movement.

Adair (1, p. 28) completed a study in the spring of 1967 that attempted to identify the factors which lead to teacher satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Using the Herzberg approach, a random sample of secondary teachers in upstate New York was interviewed. Adair found that the factors of the job which were satisfiers were intrinsic while the dissatisfiers were extrinsic. Teachers like recognition, to feel important, and to feel a sense of accomplishment. Teachers' organizations may have to shift their emphasis away from negotiating for higher salaries, fringe benefits, and other extrinsic factors according to Adair.

Adair refers to these extrinsic factors as the "hygiene factors" which serve only to prevent dissatisfaction, not to produce satisfaction. He further states (1, p. 29):

> To really feel like a professional, the teacher must gain some autonomy and at least share in the responsibility for planning and executing school policies.

Another study conducted by C. L. Sharma (38) attempted to determine the teachers' perception of the difference between those who were actually involved in the making of

important educational decisions and those who should be involved. He stated that teachers want more authority for the operation of the individual schools where they teach and desire to assume responsibility for all activities that concern instruction. Sharma concluded that teachers reported significant differences in their desire to participate and current practices in decision-making insofar as these practices involved participation by groups of teachers.

There is also expressed the view that all of the reasons advanced for growing restiveness of teachers are superficial, that they revolve around and point out the real and basic reason teachers are dissatisfied with their lack of participation in policy-making: "the lack of meaningful involvement of teachers in the decisions which affect their conditions of work and their general welfare" (15, p. 259).

Albeit the phrase "meaingful involvement" is vague and elusive, the writer defends his use of it by pointing out that it "can only be defined in terms of feeling--teacher feeling." Perhaps that is the most comprehensive factor that can be referred to in an investigation of teacher demands in the area of decision-making: the teacher's need to have his expertise as an educator recognized and utilized in all of the logical outlets, which would certainly include the area of educational planning and policy making.

The literature that examines the teachers' desire to

participate in decision-making more actively than they have done in the past uncovers a number of factors that appear to be significant in creating the desire or activating it. Although there is not an ample supply of empirical evidence to support any theories about which is most significant or which was first to affect teachers, among the most frequently mentioned as important factors are the following:

1. The Human Relations Movement in educational administration.
2. The increased professionalism of teachers.
3. The growing proportion of men in the teaching profession.
4. The increased bureaucracy resulting from larger and larger school systems.
5. The success and competition of teacher organizations.
6. The great demand for teachers during the past decade.
7. The need for recognition and a sense of accomplishment on the part of the teachers.

Reactions to Teachers' Desire to Participate

The literature reveals that reactions have been favorable for participation of teachers in decision-making for the most part, one of the reasons for which may probably be that teachers are better educated today than at any previous time in the history of our educational systems. Ninety per cent of today's teachers hold bachelor's degrees and nearly 25 per cent hold some type of graduate degree (35, p. 197).

That these resources of teacher expertise have not been tapped heretofore seems to be a serious charge aimed at administrators and school boards by almost every segment of the education community. Even the administrators themselves seem to be willing to indict their fellow administrators and board members for failing to make more use of teachers in forming educational policy.

Nation's Schools (6, p. 5) recently conducted an opinion poll which they based on a 5 per cent proportional sampling of 14,000 school administrators in 50 states. The following questions were asked of these administrators, and the resultant answers were tabulated and recorded in the summary of the poll which appears on the following page.

1. Do you feel that teachers should become more involved in school management functions?

   76% Yes 24% No

2. In what areas would you like to see teachers become more involved?

   27% curriculum

   13% determination and implementation of grievance procedures

   12% determination of school policy

   17% teacher evaluation

   22% student discipline

   3% selection of school principals

   4% selection of new teachers

1% school budget

1% other areas

3. Have you made an effort to get your teachers to function in any of the above areas?

97% Yes 3% No

4. If so, what has been the general reaction?

15% don't want to be involved

38% carry out duties apathetically

47% cooperate fully

Thus, administrators seem to be recognizing both the need for and the advantages of including teachers in decision-making bodies.

Marshall (29, p. 41) sees three advantages of these group decisions: 1) group decision-making tends to make administration easier; 2) it tends to improve job performance; and 3) it tends to improve the quality of the decisions reached.

His advantages have the support of an impressive body of literature which attempts to prove that personnel participants are more willing to accept and implement policies when they feel they have had a role in creating them. Johansen's (24, p. 81) study of the relationships between teachers' perceptions of influence in local curriculum decision-making and curriculum implementation states as one of its conclusions:

> Individual teacher participation in curriculum development activities in and of itself increases the likelihood of curriculum implementation. The findings of this study suggest that educators can expect that curriculum guides developed with wide teacher participation are more likely to be implemented than those prepared singularly or by a very small representative group.

The theory that group participation improves the quality of the decisions is also subscribed to by many writers. Two frequently referred to writers, Schmuck and Blumberg (39, p. 89) agree that "where efficiency depends on continued coordination and interaction of a number of persons, a decision produced by the group to be involved will almost always be superior to one produced even by the most capable of individuals."

Frey (15, p. 261) even states such concepts as assumptions:

> (1) People make a commitment to the institutions in which they work to the extent that they feel that they have a voice in making the decisions that affect their work and well-being.
>
> (2) Better policy ensues when those directly affected by it have an opportunity to participate in its formulation. Teachers, as a highly educated professional group, are in a position to make unique and worthwhile contributions to educational policy.

Another point often made in viewing the quality of resultant decisions is that, in the complexity of today's educational systems, no one person can know enough about everything to make the most logical, informed decision in

any one of many different areas. Since teachers are sometimes perceived to be closer to problems of the school than the administrator, and sometimes are more familiar with particular fields, their help seems to be considered by the writers of the literature a very real asset for administrators, board members, and students.

In fact, some writers suggest that, as teachers become better qualified and more willing to take a more active role in decision-making, the board has the responsibility to seek their assistance. "Instead of the board's feeling that it is granting a privilege to the teachers, it should be actively seeking the help of all personnel in planning and operating the schools" (30, p. 14).

The board members have employed administrators to organize and regulate the school systems in the most effective manner possible, which does not necessarily mean that the administrators make the decisions on policy by themselves. Daniel Griffiths (18) sees the failure to properly allocate human resources as ineffective administration, and a vital failure to allocating resources occurs in his view when the talents of the teachers are not tapped.

If the central purpose of the school is teaching, then the resources of the system should be employed in such a manner as to maximize teaching, and that would seem to require at least some participation by the people who are doing the

teaching, maintains Mr. Griffiths (18).

The theory that administration is largely a matter of dealing with resources for optimum benefits in the future for all members of the school community is also emphasized by John Dawson (12).

Professors of educational administration seem to rather generally agree that staff participation in decision-making results in a greater desire on the part of the staff to accomplish the goals of the institution. Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer (9, p. 240) verbalize this feeling in their book. They state that teachers are hoping to exert an influence on the educational program which is their professional stake in education when they participate in decision-making. They also feel that teacher participation is justified by both experience and research, which show it to be the most effective means we have to accomplish the purposes for which schools were organized.

Smith (40, p. 273) reiterates the importance of teaching in the overall view of schools and places the responsibility for utilizing the abilities of his teachers on the shoulders of the administrators. He states:

> The phrase 'leaders in education' often refers to a group of administrators; furthermore, it is assumed that leadership in education must come from appointed leaders. But administration is a secondary function that supports education's primary function, teaching; as the servant of teaching, the administrator can help the faculty

> to share in the leadership of the organization. Group decisions should be made by the people whom the decisions affect. An administrator should try to involve all people, or their representatives, in any important decisions that will affect them.

Thus, Smith would seem to agree with Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer in believing that, in order to optimize the effectiveness of any school staff, the administrator should take advantage of teachers' creative abilities, a practice which in turn demands an organizational structure that will encourage wide participation by the staff of any school in the decision-making that affects that particular school. Considering all of the approaches known at this time, Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer (9, p. 241) write that this cooperative approach is better than any other approach yet devised.

Many of the reactions of educators to the concept of staff involvement in decision-making have led to studies. Gifford (16) studied the effects of involving teachers in decision-making. He involved 99 elementary principals and 474 elementary teachers from three Utah school districts in the study. The results indicated that the more teachers were involved in the decision-making process, the more positive were their attitudes toward their work. The teachers' need for authority or independence did not affect that conclusion, as both those with and without an extreme need for authority reacted to participating in the same

manner.

Beaumont (5) investigated the attitudes of teachers who had participated in the establishment of a counseling program as contrasted the attitudes of those teachers who had had nothing to do with the initiation of the program. The results of his study were very similar to those obtained by Gifford (16).

Smittle (41) attempted to answer two major questions in relation to teacher participation in decision-making: 1) What do teachers and administrators consider to be the most crucial decision they make? 2) What relationship exists between administrators' and teachers' perceptions of the role of teachers in the decision-making process? In his study he sampled 1,263 teachers and 181 administrators in Montgomery County, Ohio.

Both the administrators and the teachers in his study agreed that the most crucial decisions were related to the aims of education in general and the curricular programs in the community. Twenty-one categories were then examined, ranging from setting goals to planning faculty picnics. Teachers showed little desire to make decisions regarding planning school buildings, making class schedules, spending money, promoting and/or firing certified and noncertified personnel. Administrators agreed that these were not proper areas in which teachers should be involved.

Highest involvement or crucial scores for teachers were found for categories on instructional materials, pupil conduct, setting goals, promotion, grading and reporting practices, and faculty parties and picnics.

Much of the literature agrees with the administrators in Smittle's study (41) in concluding that teachers should be most actively involved in the areas of instruction and curriculum. Harris (20, p. 430) is concerned with the role of teachers in the formulation of policy related to curriculum. He agrees with Campbell that the most effective means of bringing about curriculum change is through teacher participation since curriculum changes are dependent upon changes that take place in people.

Grimes (19, p. 346) feels that boards of education and administrators across the nation are in agreement with teachers that teachers should have a greater role in the setting of educational policy, "particularly in reference to making decisions about curriculum, where the professional knowledge of the teachers might be put to its greatest use."

Just as curriculum and instruction are most frequently mentioned as areas in which teachers should be appropriately involved, there are also areas that investigators view as inappropriate for teacher involvement. Southworth (42, p. 65) clarifies what those areas might be from the point of view of an administrator: he sees administration today as a

dynamic and changing structure, one that will continue to change, "and one of the changes it must accept is the greater participation of teachers in school affairs, but only in those areas in which their training and temperament can participate effectively."

He further warns that when teachers attempt to assume the tasks of hiring, supervising, and evaluating prospective and fellow teachers, without the participation of any administrator, they are entering a job realm for which they are not prepared by either education or experience. Southworth's seven pragmatic questions about how teachers would solve the ensuing problems in the event that they do become involved in those areas make it difficult to see how teachers can function as personnel managers and still do an effective job of teaching. He states his solution to these conflicts in the area of teacher participation in personnel and supervision (42, p. 66):

> The answer is simple. Let the administrators who are trained by university work and by experience make the administrative decisions. It was precisely because of this need for someone outside the classroom to make administrative decisions that school administration in this country developed. What the teachers are trying to do is to turn the clock back to a simpler era, and to use simple solutions for complex questions.

Further evidence that these negative feelings exist concerning the participation of teachers in decision-making on a formal level is found in the conclusion of a study

conducted by Robert Carson (10) at the University of Oregon in 1965.

His study attempted to determine some of the ways in which teachers relate themselves to the community through their participation in educational decision-making and other community affairs. The study compared teacher responses to the perceptions and expectations which three other respondent groups--administrators, school board members, and community leaders--have concerning teacher participation. His conclusions include the following:

> Teachers feel that they should be involved in educational decision-making to a greater extent than they have been.
>
> In general, all groups perceive the extent to which teachers should participate in educational decisions at a slightly lower level than teachers perceive for themselves. Principals and administrators more nearly agree with teachers as to what their role should be than do school board members and community influentials.

Reactions, then, have not been wholly favorable, especially in reference to boards of education, but the literature does mark a trend for administrators to be favorably disposed to the idea of enlarging the teachers' role in many areas of decision-making, especially curriculum and instruction. Many studies, such as the following, give administrators very practical reasons to be favorably disposed.

Walters (46) made a study in Mississippi in 1967 that summarizes present knowledge in this area in the following optimistic manner:

> The results indicate that many teachers and administrators are confident that teacher participation brings about desirable effects and contributed to the general welfare of the children as well as to the school faculty and staff.

Some of the studies which have contributed to our knowledge in this area were done in fields other than education. One such study was conducted by Fleishman and Harris (14), who investigated relationships between leader behavior of industrial supervisors and the behavior of their group members at the International Harvester Company. They used "Consideration" and "Structure" to designate leader behavior. Consideration emphasized group participation in decision-making and more concern for group needs; in structure, the supervisors defined group activity. Of the two, consideration was the dominant factor in the relationship between supervisors and their group members. Grievances and turnover rates were highest in the groups having low consideration, regardless of the degree of structure.

Other studies that may lead administrators to form favorable reactions for teacher participation include Leiman's study (25, p. 509) which determined that those teachers who said they had a voice in decision-making had more positive attitudes toward their principals, colleagues,

and toward their pupils; they also had a higher regard for themselves and for the teaching profession.

A similar study which expresses support for the practice of involving teachers in decision-making is one conducted by Pierce and Albright (34, p. 30).

Manning (28, p. 14) agrees with these findings and supports what he terms a "fundamental principle of administration", which is that "those affected by a decision should be involved in the making of it." He further submits that, in a democratic society, decisions which are made bilaterally are much more effective than those made unilaterally.

Lucio and McNeil (26, p. 82) are also avid supporters of the practice of involving teachers in the making of important educational decisions. Among the reasons they cite for encouraging wide participation in decision-making are: 1) that it increases the range of alternatives likely to result, 2) it includes factors which contribute to the workability of the decisions, and 3) it increases the attractiveness of the idea to those expected to execute the decisions.

Gordon (17, p. 64) also advocates that people will more readily accept and carry out a course of action if they have previously participated in the process of deciding on the particular course of action. He found that involvement of members in a small group increases the quality of the

decisions made and the amount and quality of production by the group. He also concluded that, when members are allowed a voice in decision-making, they showed more initiative, independence, and were less hostile to each other.

This decrease in hostility may be more important than it appears. Former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John Gardner is quoted by the editor of Personnel Administration, Fred Peterson (33, p. 2), as believing that lack of opportunity to participate in the making of important decisions affecting our lives is one of the principal causes of personal dilemma experienced by modern day citizens.

More formal reactions to the growing demand for teacher participation in decision-making are found in state statutes passed during the past five years. The states of Oregon, California, Connecticut, Washington, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Michigan, Massachusetts, among others at the time of this writing have passed statutes that allow for teachers to present, discuss, and solve matters of mutual concern, such as salaries, fringe benefits, personnel policies, and working conditions.

Their relevance to the nature of this study lies in the phrasing of these recent statutes which includes a much more comprehensive area of public education in the debate arena than teachers considered possible only a few years ago.

Whereas once the teachers' demand was only for open

negotiation for salaries, now the demand is for participation in almost every area of public education. The California statute (37) attempts to outline the broad area open to cooperative decision-making now. Under that law, a public school employer

> shall meet and confer with representatives of employee organizations upon request with regard to all matters relating to employment conditions and employer-employee relations, and in addition, shall meet and confer with representatives of employee organizations representing certificated employees upon request with regard to all matters relating to the definition of educational objectives, the determination of the content of course and curricula, the selection of textbooks, and other aspects of the instructional program to the extent such matters are within the discretion of the public school employer or governing board under law.

The general reaction of the education community to the teachers' desire to participate in decision-making, as it is reflected in the literature, seems to be that it is long overdue. Although administrators and board members may be somewhat skeptical about what areas are appropriate for teacher involvement, for all general purposes they agree that teachers have not been involved to the extent that they should have been in the past.

This section is concluded with a colloquial explanation of what the growing activism of teachers really means by Lester Bell (4, p. 92), Curriculum Advisor for Children's Press.

> Like it or not, the American teacher has said, in effect, 'Mr. Administrator, Mr. Board Member, Mr. Principal, you haven't done such a good job. We are going to get in there and we're going to share in decisions on instruction, methods, and materials . . . Are today's activist teachers up to this new role? I think so. These new teachers, these cool cats, are a new kind of teacher . . . . They understand 'today' better than anyone because they were born and raised in this world. They are better trained and better oriented. They are sophisticated and up to the job that must be done. These teachers are going to change the curriculum . . . because they know better than anyone just what education is all about.

Experiments with Staff Participation in Decision-Making

Research is somewhat limited in describing methods and procedures for teacher involvement in decision-making.

Sherman H. Frey (15, p. 261) proposes elimination of the traditional line-staff model of personnel relationships. Frey maintains that decision-making emanating from a board of education to a superintendent, to a teacher denies to the good of society the fullest use of our most vital resource--human thought and knowledge--for the solution of educational problems.

He proposes a model predicated upon the following assumptions:

(1) People make a commitment to the institutions in which they work to the extent that they feel that they have a voice in making the decisions that affect their work.

(2) Better policy ensues when those directly affected by it have the opportunity to participate in its formulation.

(3) The board of education is the final decision-making body in policy formulation.

Frey proposes a model consisting of three basic policy committees elected by the professional staff from among its own membership. Each of the three committees, Educational Policy, Fiscal, and Personnel Policy, would deliberate on the problems that confronted it, hold hearings, and bring in consultants.

Under such a model, the administration would serve, at committee discretion, in an advisory capacity. The committees would be charged with the responsibility of making policy recommendations directly to the board of education. Committees thus formed would devote themselves only to policy formulation, not policy execution. Once policies were adopted by the board, they would be published and would serve to guide the administration of the school system.

Frey (15) anticipates numerous advantages of the previous described method of staff involvement. Initially, direct contact with the board of education through the medium of freely elected representatives would assure each teacher of meaningful involvement in the process of policy formulation. Furthermore, teachers would be encouraged to make commitment to the institution in which they work because of being assured of a voice in the decisions which directly affect their work.

Recognizing that teachers should be involved in decision-making, Marvin L. Marshall (29, p. 41) lists several steps that should be followed as teachers become involved in the process. Among the desired steps are the following:

(1) Recognition of the problem

(2) Analysis of problems

(3) Collection of data

(4) Formulation of solutions

(5) Selection of the preferred solution

Marshall concludes that employment of these steps will provide the following advantages:

(1) Through recognition of the problem, a permissive attitude that facilitates discussion will result.

(2) In the analysis of a given problem, the exchange of information among persons with similar responsibilities but with different viewpoints will often contribute to successful problem analysis.

(3) Through collection of data those involved in the decision-making process will gain more understanding of possible alternative solutions to the problem.

(4) Formulation and selection of a preferred solution will be a logical consequence of involving decision-makers throughout each of the five previously listed steps.

Stangel (43, p. 39) relates how curriculum councils in English, mathematics, social studies, science, and foreign language have been utilized in Winchester, Massachusetts.

Functioning under the assumption that teachers ought to be involved in the decision-making process regarding what to teach, how to teach it, and to whom, the councils were composed of a chairman, (the director of his own discipline for grades K-12), and three other teachers, one for the junior high schools, another for intermediate grades, and a third for the primary grades. The assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction acts as a liaison between the councils and the administration.

The writer lists several accomplishments of the councils, among them being new programs in handwriting, spelling, resource kits in social studies, and effective use of instructional materials in foreign language instruction. In general, each council has recommended numerous curriculum revisions, and many have been accepted by the administration and board of education.

Grimes (19) further describes the utilization of teachers in curriculum at San Mateo Union High School in California. The committee, known as the Academy of Instruction, consists of representatives from the seven regular high schools in addition to a representative from the continuation school. These teachers, elected on an alternate basis for two-year terms, are joined by department head representatives selected by each subject area group. From among members is selected an executive board of five members, who meet once

a month on a school day to plan full Academy meetings and confer with the superintendent and staff.

As spelled out in the constitution of the organization, the executive board takes the responsibility for the full program of the Academy and is then fully accountable to its members. Recommendations of the executive board are submitted in writing and presented to the entire Academy for discussion.

Among the projects studied by the curriculum group and approved by the board of education are several including:

(1) Establishment of a Projects Evaluation Committee which has published needs of the district in terms of curriculum,

(2) Implementation of a teacher executive program which consists of a selected teacher who works in a larger realm than his own classroom during the time of his appointment in order to bring some special benefit of his knowledge or innovation to the entire instructional program.

(3) Involvement of staff in ways of assessing and testing out means of securing quality assurance in the education of district students, including follow-up studies, use of simulation, and new testing procedures.

Frequently referred to in the literature is Blumberg, Wayson, and Weber's "Elementary School Cabinet" (7). Briefly, the authors describe the methodology employed by an elementary school principal to involve teachers in the decision-making process in his school. In the ghetto school described, the school situation became characterized

by daily crises of discipline, staff communication, and lack of a clear cut policy on many issues associated with the daily functioning of the school.

To solve the problem, a school cabinet consisting of teachers and aides at each grade level was formed, the purpose of which was to render advice to the principal on matters of policy formulation, staff communications, and school-community relations.

In terms of results, the teachers have formed and carried out the duties of the following committees: a teacher duty committee which has assigned hall duty that teachers subscribed to; a space committee which has assumed responsibility about space allocations; and a recruitment committee which has created a recruitment booklet for job candidates.

In addition to results, the authors have noted several conclusions based upon the involvement of staff in policy formulation. The results indicate that if teachers are given the opportunity to take part in meaningful organization work--not trivia--teachers will do so and will be productive. Furthermore, the abdication of a traditional hierarchical style on the part of the principal in favor of staff involvement does not necessarily mean that he will lose his influence over the school system. The results appear to indicate that as teachers are involved in worth-

while policy formulation, the principal attains more influence over matters of substance that are more important to him than matters of procedure.

Schmuck and Blumberg (39, p. 103) appear to summarize the results of teacher participation in decision-making as this investigator is able to observe them at this time when they state that the results include the following:

(1) heightened sense of power on the part of the teacher--a feeling tends to develop that school policies will develop in a way that teachers want it to develop;

(2) sense of ownership of the school--when a teacher can control his environment, he tends to become proprietary about it;

(3) a higher commitment to the school as an organization;

(4) a sense of concern for the state of education;

(5) a forcing of the isolated teacher out of the self-contained classroom.

Summary

Teacher participation in decision-making is an outgrowth of the democratic administration concept that has developed during the past few decades. Recognizing the factors of increased men in the profession, better educated teachers, increased strength of teacher organizations, and increased professionalism of teachers, administrators have, in many cases, approved and sought more teacher participation in decision-making.

The educational community has welcomed teacher participation based upon numerous assumptions. Among those frequently cited are the following:

(A) Group decision-making tends to make administration easier.

(B) Group decision-making tends to improve the quality of decisions.

(C) It tends to maximize the use of human resources with an objective of maximum educational benefits.

(D) It tends to improve the quality of educational policy in that those affected by policy are involved in its formulation.

While diversity characterizes the areas that teachers should be involved in relation to decision-making, some research has indicated that teachers desire to be involved in two broad areas: educational program policy and personnel policy. These areas of preference appear logical in that both areas occupy much of teachers' time and efforts.

Research has indicated that the results of teacher participation in decision-making have been favorable. Of particular interest are the results described in terms of teachers actively participating in curricular decision-making.

Thus, the concept of teacher participation in decision-making is predicated on many assumptions, has been accepted favorably by the teachers, administrators, and investigators, and has worked effectively in terms of broad areas of education.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The problem of this study was to determine selected factors which might influence teachers' desire to participate in education decision-making in terms of program policy and personnel policy at three levels: planning, implementation, and evaluation. This study also attempted to determine teachers' willingness to assume responsibility for educational decisions.

This chapter describes the methods and procedures that were used to gather and analyze the data required for the study. The chapter has been divided into five parts:

1. Selection of the sample for the study
2. The description of the instrument
3. Construction of the instrument
4. Collection of the data
5. Treatment of the data collected

Selecting the Sample

The advantages of sampling as compared with complete enumeration as listed by Cochran (11) are reduced costs, greater speed, greater scope, and greater accuracy.

The sample for this study was selected from a population of all public school systems in the state of Iowa. Employing the stratification design as described in an official publication of Iowa Department of Public Instruc-

tion (21) the following strata and total school enrollment intervals were utilized:

Strata	Total School Enrollment
1	200-499
2	500-749
3	750-999
4	1000-1499
5	1500-1999
6	2000-2999
7	3000 and over

From each of the above strata, school systems were chosen. A list of selected schools appears in Appendix A. In order to insure a proper sample size of 100 per stratum, the questionnaire was distributed to an equal number of elementary and secondary schools from those schools listed in Appendix A.

Description of the Instrument

The instrument used in this study was a questionnaire designed by the investigator to test the validity of the null hypotheses as described in the first chapter. See Appendix B.

Construction of the Instrument

The questionnaire was designed so that statistical treatment would allow the investigator to examine the

dependence and independence of the variables through the use of the chi square statistic.

The first part of the questionnaire sought personal information from the selected teachers. These items included necessary information such as age, sex, membership in professional organizations, educational level, recency of educational training, number of years within a school system, and grade level taught.

The second part of the questionnaire attempted to determine teachers' willingness to participate in decision-making at each of three levels: planning, implementation, and evaluation. Ten questions were asked with five questions pertaining to the two areas of educational program policy and personnel policy. Teachers were asked to respond to various situations which exemplified decision-making in the public school systems.

Part III of the questionnaire attempted to determine teachers' willingness to assume responsibility for decisions in which they were involved in the formulation stage. Ten hypothetical situations divided equally between the two areas of educational program policy and personnel policy necessitated a response from the teachers in the study. In the development of this part of the questionnaire an attempt was made to select decision-making situations which best exemplified problem areas as determined through the review

of literature.

Collection of the Data

After consulting with the educational statistics section of Iowa State University, it was decided that a sample size of approximately 700 would insure proper statistical treatment of the data. In view of the large sample size and the extensive variation in school size, a decision was made to send a letter soliciting support for the project and sufficient questionnaires for teacher distribution to superintendents in school districts listed under strata 1, 2, and 3. See Appendix C. In those school districts listed under strata 4, 5, and 6, it was decided to send a letter soliciting support and questionnaires for teacher distribution to principals. Within stratum those schools consisting of more than one elementary or secondary attendance center will be chosen on a random sampling basis.

Treatment of the Data

As the data were received, they were recorded and percentages of return were noted. After tabulation was completed and summarized for totals, appropriate tables for exhibiting the data were developed and presented in the chapter on Findings.

Statistical Treatment

The chi square statistical treatment was used to compare the frequency of choices to the statements involving desire to participate in decision-making and willingness to assume responsibility.

An example of one of the null hypothesis was: There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of age and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in educational program policy.

The chi square test of dependence and independence was calculated from the formula (36, p. 292):

$$X^2 = \frac{(\text{Actual frequency} - \text{expected frequency})^2}{\text{expected frequency}}$$

The degrees of freedom for this statistic are (r-1) (c-1) where r equals the number of rows and c equals the number of columns in the table. The computed X^2 value for each of the hypothesis was compared with the tabulated values of the X^2 distribution at the appropriate level of significance.

A significant difference refers to a value which exceeds the tabular value with the appropriate degrees of freedom at the five per cent (.05) level. The (.05) level has been chosen since most of the research investigated substantiated its usage.

FINDINGS

Seven hundred questionnaires were sent to teachers utilizing procedures discussed in the previous chapter. After several telephone requests, a total of 586 or 84 per cent of the questionnaires were returned.

One problem of the study was to determine selected factors influencing teachers' desire to participate in decision-making at three levels of involvement in terms of educational program policy and personnel policy.

A second aspect of the study was to determine teachers' willingness to assume responsibility for decisions.

The data in this chapter were divided into the two previously stated major divisions--selected factors influencing teachers' desire to participate in decision-making at three levels of involvement.

The factors of age, sex, number of years in current school system, level of major teaching assignment, educational level, year in which teacher reached educational level, membership in professional associations, and size of school system were applied to decision-making in terms of educational program policy and personnel policy through use of the chi-square statistic. Within the areas of program policy and personnel policy, decision-making was subdivided into three stages or levels: planning, implementation, and evaluation.

The following 48 hypotheses were tested in relation to Part II of the questionnaire.

Hypothesis No. 1. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of age and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in planning educational program policy.

Item A of questions 1 thru 5 were designed to test the validity of the null hypothesis. The chi-square test of dependence and independence resulted in only one rejection of the null hypothesis (see Table 1).

Table 1. Age versus desire to participate in program policy

Response	Age 20-35	36-50	51 and older	Subtotal	
A	84	59	67	210	
B,C,D	189	117	70	376	
Subtotal	273	176	137	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 13.634$ X^{2**}, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

An examination of Table 1 revealed a dependence between the factor of age and willingness to participate in planning of educational program policy at the .01 level. Dependence

of the variables resulted from an overproportion of teachers between ages of 20-35 desiring to participate.

Since the null hypothesis was rejected only once in reference to question 1, item A, the researcher failed, in general, to reject the null hypothesis. Teachers' responses to questions 2A, 3A, 4A, and 5A revealed no significant differences between ages of teachers and desire to participate in educational program policy.

Hypothesis No. 2. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of age and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in implementing educational program policy.

In questions 1 thru 5, response B was indicative of teachers' desire to participate in implementing program policy. No significant chi-square results were obtained. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis No. 3. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of age and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in evaluating educational program policy.

Response C of questions 1 thru 5 were designed to test the validity of the null hypothesis. The null hypothesis was not rejected in respect to responses 1C, 3C, 4C, and 5C. However, question 2, item C revealed a significant difference (see Table 2).

Table 2. Age versus desire to participate in evaluating educational program policy

Response	Age 20-35	36-50	51 and older	Subtotal	
C	99	45	32	176	
A,B,D	174	131	105	410	
Subtotal	273	176	137	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 9.618$ X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

An inspection of Table 2 revealed dependence among the variables of age and desire to participate in evaluating educational program policy. Through individually calculating the expected frequencies per cell the researcher discovered that in the normal population one would expect fewer teachers between ages 20-35 to choose response C. More teachers in ages 36-50 and 51 and older could be expected to choose response C. Table 2 revealed that those teachers in age categories two and three were less willing to participate in evaluating educational program policy than could normally be expected.

In general, the null hypothesis no. 3 was not rejected as only 1 of 5 questions indicated a significant difference.

Hypothesis No. 4. There is no significant difference

between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of age and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in planning personnel policy (see Tables 3, 4, 5).

Table 3. Age versus desire to participate in planning personnel policies

Response	Age 20-35	36-50	51 and older	Subtotal	
A	176	111	102	378	
B,C,D	108	65	35	208	
Subtotal	273	176	137	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 8.050$ X^2*, 2 d.f. = 5.991

*.05 level of significance.

Table 4. Age versus desire to participate in planning personnel policies

Response	Age 20-35	36-50	51 and older	Subtotal	
A	121	78	88	287	
B,C,D	152	98	49	299	
Subtotal	273	176	137	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 16.656$ X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

Table 5. Age versus desire to participate in planning personnel policies

Response	Age 20-35	36-50	51 and older	Subtotal	
A	129	60	44	233	
B,C,D	144	116	93	353	
Subtotal	273	176	137	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 12.656 X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

An examination of the data presented in Tables 3, 4, and 5 revealed a significance between the two variables of age and desire to participate in planning personnel policies. The significant differences were found in reference to questions 7, item A, 9, item A, and 10, item A. Calculation of the expected frequencies (sub row total x sub column total ÷ grand total) indicated that one could expect fewer respondents between ages of 20-35 to choose response A. Similarly one could expect more teachers to choose response A in age group 36-51.

Questions 6 and 8 did not reveal any significant differences.

Since respondents illustrated a significant difference on 3 of the 5 questions, the researcher discovered a trend

towards desire to become involved in planning of personnel policies and rejected the null hypothesis. On the basis of the data under investigation there appeared a relationship between age and desire to be involved in planning of personnel policies. Younger respondents desired to become involved significantly more frequently than older respondents.

Hypothesis No. 5. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of age and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in implementing personnel policy.

In questions 6 thru 10, response B was indicative of teachers' desire to participate in implementing personnel policy. No significant chi-square results were obtained. The hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis No. 6. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of age and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy.

Response C of questions 6 thru 10 were intended to test the previously stated null hypothesis. No significant chi-square values were obtained; consequently, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis No. 7. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of sex and on the criterion variable of desire to participate

in planning educational program policy.

Questions 1 thru 5, choice A were designed to test the validity of the null hypothesis. Significant differences were found in results tabulated from questions 1, 2, and 3.

Individually calculating the expected frequencies the researcher discovered that fewer males than normally expected desired to participate in planning program policy. On the basis of Tables 6, 7, and 8 one would expect 73, 140, and 80 males to choose item A.

Table 6. Sex versus desire to participate in planning program policy

	Sex			
Response	Male	Female	Subtotal	
A	53	57	210	
B,C,D	152	224	376	
Subtotal	205	381	586	Total
Cal. X^2 = 13.665		X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635		

**.01 level of significance.

Questions 4 and 5 indicated no significant differences in terms of the criterion variable under investigation. Thus, the researcher noted significant differences in 3 of the 5 questions designed to test the null hypothesis.

Table 7. Sex versus desire to participate in planning program policy

Response	Sex: Male	Female	Subtotal	
A	121	281	402	
B,C,D	84	100	184	
Subtotal	205	381	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 13.424 X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

Table 8. Sex versus desire to participate in planning program policy

Response	Sex: Male	Female	Subtotal	
A	60	169	229	
B,C,D	145	212	357	
Subtotal	205	381	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 12.746 X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

The null hypothesis was rejected on the basis of the notable trend. There appeared to be a relationship between

sex and desire to participate in planning program policy. The significant difference was due to the fewer than expected number of males who desired to participate in planning program policy.

Hypothesis No. 8. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of sex and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in implementing educational program policy.

Question 1, response B indicated a significant difference (see Table 9).

Table 9. Sex versus desire to participate in implementing program policy

Response	Sex: Male	Female	Subtotal	
B	44	52	96	
A,C,D	161	329	490	
Subtotal	205	381	586	Total
	Cal. $X^2 = 5.943$	X^2*, 1 d.f. = 3.841		

*.05 level of significance.

Table 9 indicated a significant difference due to the less than expected number of females who desired to participate in program policy decisions at the implementation

level.

However, no significant differences were obtained from items B of questions 2, 3, 4, and 5.

The researcher failed to reject hypothesis no. 8. There appeared to be no dependence between the factors of sex and willingness to participate in implementation of educational program policy.

Hypothesis No. 9. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of sex and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in evaluating educational program policy.

Item C of questions 1 thru 5 were designed to determine if significant differences would occur between sexes and desire to become involved in evaluating educational program policy. Significant differences were found in respondents' choices of item C in questions 1, 2, and 3. Tables 10, 11, and 12 are representative of the differences.

Tables 10, 11, and 12 revealed significant differences in that more females should be expected to respond to item C. The tables indicated that a larger proportion of males than should be expected in the normal population desired to participate in evaluating program policy.

Questions 4 and 5 revealed no significant differences in terms of the variables under investigation.

In general, a trend was noted in that significant

Table 10. Sex versus desire to participate in evaluating program policy

Response	Sex: Male	Female	Subtotal	
C	84	108	192	
A,B,D	121	273	394	
Subtotal	205	381	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 9.650$ X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

Table 11. Sex versus desire to participate in evaluating program policy

Response	Sex: Male	Female	Subtotal	
C	72	104	176	
A,B,D	133	277	410	
Subtotal	205	381	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 3.884$ X^2*, 1 d.f. = 3.841

*.05 level of significance.

differences were observable in 3 of 5 questions designed to measure differences. Evidence indicated that males were

Table 12. Sex versus desire to participate in evaluating program policy

Response	Sex: Male	Female	Subtotal	
C	95	209	304	
A,B,D	110	172	282	
Subtotal	205	381	586	Total
Cal. X^2 = 3.870		X^2*, 1 d.f. = 3.841		

*.05 level of significance.

more willing to become involved in evaluating program policy than should be expected. The null hypothesis was rejected. Desire to participate in evaluating program policy was dependent upon sex.

Hypothesis No. 10. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of sex and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in planning personnel policy.

Questions 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 attempted to measure if sex were independent of desire to participate in planning personnel policy. Item A of questions 6, 9, and 10 revealed no significant differences at either the .01 or .05 level.

Questions 7 and 8 indicated significant differences as illustrated in Tables 13 and 14.

Table 13. Sex versus desire to participate in planning personnel policy

Response	Sex: Male	Female	Subtotal	
A	115	263	378	
B,C,D	90	118	208	
Subtotal	205	381	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 9.734 X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

Table 14. Sex versus desire to participate in planning personnel policy

Response	Sex: Male	Female	Subtotal	
A	117	259	376	
B,C,D	88	122	210	
Subtotal	205	381	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 6.894 X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

An investigation of the expected frequencies determined by row subtotal x column subtotal ÷ grand total revealed

that fewer males than expected desired to participate in planning of personnel policy. Calculated expectancies indicated that approximately 132 males could normally be expected to participate at the planning level of personnel policy.

However, since only two questions indicated significant differences, the null hypothesis was not rejected. There appeared little relationship between sex and desire to participate in planning of personnel policy.

Hypothesis No. 11. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of sex and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in implementing personnel policy.

Item B of questions 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 attempted to determine if significant differences existed between the variable of sex and desire to participate in implementing personnel policy. Tables 15, 16, and 17 correspond to the significant differences found in questions 6, 7, and 8.

An analysis of Tables 15, 16, and 17 revealed the significant differences resulted from fewer number of males choosing response B. Corresponding to the previously presented tables, 114 males, 155 males, and 188 males could normally be expected to desire to participate in implementing personnel policy. Conversely fewer females should be expected to choose item B in the question under

Table 15. Sex versus desire to participate in implementing personnel policy

Response	Sex: Male	Female	Subtotal	
B	79	248	327	
A,C,D	126	133	259	
Subtotal	205	381	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 38.109 X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance

Table 16. Sex versus desire to participate in implementing personnel policy

Response	Sex: Male	Female	Subtotal	
B	139	306	445	
A,C,D	66	75	141	
Subtotal	205	381	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 11.416 X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

investigation.

No differences were found in regard to respondents'

Table 17. Sex versus desire to participate in implementing personnel policy

Response	Sex: Male	Female	Subtotal	
B	177	362	539	
A,C,D	28	19	47	
Subtotal	205	381	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 13.586 X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

choices on questions 9 and 10.

It appeared to the researcher that a trend existed on the basis of collected data which refuted the validity of the null hypothesis. The null hypothesis was rejected. The factor of sex was not independent of desire to participate in implementing personnel policy. Questionnaire returns revealed that more females than expected and fewer males than expected desired to participate at the implementation level of personnel policy decision-making.

Hypothesis No. 12. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of sex and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy.

Items C of questions 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 tested the

null hypothesis. No significant differences were found by the use of the chi-square statistic in reference to questions 7, 8, and 10.

On questions 6 and 9 significant differences were found which are illustrated in Tables 18 and 19.

Table 18. Sex versus desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy

Response	Sex Male	Female	Subtotal	
C	85	257	342	
A,B,D	120	124	244	
Subtotal	205	381	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 37.051 X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

Table 19. Sex versus desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy

Response	Sex Male	Female	Subtotal	
C	157	331	488	
A,B,D	48	50	98	
Subtotal	205	381	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 10.136 X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

In reference to Tables 18 and 19 the significant difference was due statistically to the fewer than expected number of men who desired to participate in the evaluation level of personnel policy.

However, 3 of the 5 questions resulted in no significant difference between sex and desire to become involved in evaluating personnel policy decision-making. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Sex appeared to be independent of desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy.

Hypothesis No. 13. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of number of years in a school system and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in planning in educational program policy.

Five chi-square tests on items A of questions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 resulted in no significant differences between number of years in a school system and desire to participate in planning of educational program policy.

Number of years within a school system were categorized into 1-5 years, 6-10 years, and 11 or more years with no significant difference discernible in any category. On the basis of the collected data, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis. Number of years within a school system was independent of desire to become involved

in the planning stage of educational program policy.

Hypothesis No. 14. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of number of years in a school system and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in implementing an educational program policy.

Again no significant differences were in reference to item B of the questionnaire. Responses to questions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 revealed that desire to participate in the implementation aspect of educational program policy was not dependent upon the number of years teachers were employed in a school system.

Hypothesis No. 15. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of number of years in a school system and desire to participate in evaluating educational program policy.

The categories of number of years within a school system, 1-5, 6-10, and 11 or more revealed no significant differences.

On the basis of the research conducted, involvement in evaluating program policy was not dependent upon length of service of teachers. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis No. 16. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis

of number of years in a school system and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in planning personnel policy.

Item A of questions 7, 8, 9, and 10 revealed no significant differences when teachers were categorized by years in a school system and desire to participate in planning personnel policy.

Question 6 did reveal differences which are presented in Table 20.

Table 20. Number of years in a school system versus desire to participate in planning personnel policy

Response	No. of years within a school system 1-5	6-10	11 or more	Subtotal	
A	159	46	65	270	
B,C,D	160	84	72	316	
Subtotal	319	130	137	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 7.906$ X^2*, 2 d.f. = 5.991

*.05 level of significance.

An inspection of Table 20 revealed that only 46 teachers with 6-10 years experience within the same system desired to be involved in planning personnel policy. The calculated expected number of teachers with 6-10 years experience was

determined to be 59. In terms of question 6 the significant difference was found in those individuals with 6-10 years experience within the same school.

Since four questions supported the null hypothesis, the researcher failed to reject the validity of the null hypothesis. The chi-square statistic revealed no dependency between length of employment within a school system and desire to be involved in planning of personnel policy.

Hypothesis No. 17. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of number of years in a school system and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in implementing personnel policy.

Item B of questions 6, 7, 8, and 9 again revealed no significant differences between categories of years of experience of teachers and desire to participate in implementing personnel policy.

Item B of question 10 did reveal a significant difference which is illustrated in Table 21.

An inspection of Table 21 revealed a significant difference primarily due to the large number of respondents with 1-5 years within the same school that chose response B. Calculating the expectant number of respondents in the discussed cell it was discovered that 169 teachers with 1-5 years experience should have responded favorable

Table 21. Number of years in a school system versus desire to participate in implementing personnel policy

Response	No. of years within a school system 1-5	6-10	11 or more	Subtotal	
B	187	57	68	312	
A,C,D	132	73	69	274	
Subtotal	319	130	137	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 9.033$ X^2*, 2 d.f. = 5.991

*.05 level of significance.

to item B.

The null hypothesis was not rejected since only one question indicated any significant differences. Desire to participate in implementing personnel policy was not shown to be dependent upon teachers' length of service within a school system.

Hypothesis No. 18. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of number of years in a school system and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy.

Tables 22, 23, and 24 corresponding to items C of questions 6, 9, and 10 revealed a significant difference between number of years of experience in a school system

Table 22. Number of years in a school system versus desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy

Response	No. of years within a school system 1-5	6-10	11 or more	Subtotal	
C	196	59	87	342	
A,B,D	123	71	50	244	
Subtotal	319	130	137	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 11.745 X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

Table 23. Number of years in a school system versus desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy

Response	No. of years within a school system 1-5	6-10	11 or more	Subtotal	
C	258	106	124	488	
A,B,D	61	24	13	98	
Subtotal	319	130	137	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 6.748 X^2*, 2 d.f. = 5.991

*.05 level of significance.

and desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy.

In reference to Tables 22, 23, and 24 the researcher discovered that the significant differences were due to a

Table 24. Number of years in a school system versus desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy

Response	No. of years within a school system 1-5	6-10	11 or more	Subtotal	
C	151	40	68	259	
A,B,D	168	90	69	327	
Subtotal	319	130	137	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 12.420 X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

fewer number of respondents with 6-10 years of experience than expected indicating a preference to be involved in evaluation of personnel policy. Calculated expected frequencies indicated that 75, 108, and 57 respondents should have indicated a desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy within the category of 6-10 years of experience.

Questions 7 and 8 revealed no significant differences between number of years in current system and desire to engage in the evaluation process of personnel policy.

A trend toward dependence of number of years in current system and desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy was noted; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. From available data it appeared that those

respondents with 6-10 years of experience did not desire to become involved in the evaluation process as frequently as could be anticipated.

Hypothesis No. 19. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of grade level taught and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in planning in educational program policy.

Categorization of level of teaching assignment was divided into elementary (K-6), and secondary (7-12). Questions 1 thru 5, item A of each question, sought to validate the null hypothesis.

Only one of the questions intended to measure significant differences revealed no difference between level of teaching assignment and the criterion variable under investigation.

Questions 1, 2, 3, and 5 revealed significant differences. Results are illustrated in Tables 25, 26, 27, and 28.

Table 25 revealed a larger than expected number of elementary teachers, 144, who desired to participate in the planning stage of educational program policy.

Calculated expected frequencies indicated to the researcher that 106 elementary and 104 secondary teachers could normally be expected to become involved in the planning stage of educational program policy.

Table 25. Level of teaching assignment versus desire to participate in planning of educational program policy

Response	Level of teaching assignment Elementary	Secondary	Subtotal	
A	144	66	210	
B,C,D	152	224	376	
Subtotal	296	290	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 42.702 X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

Table 26. Level of teaching assignment versus desire to participate in planning of educational program policy

Response	Level of teaching assignment Elementary	Secondary	Subtotal	
A	229	173	402	
B,C,D	67	117	184	
Subtotal	296	290	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 21.329 X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

Again, the significant difference was ascribed to the greater than expected number of elementary teachers who desired to participate in educational program policy at the

Table 27. Level of teaching assignment versus desire to participate in planning of educational program policy

Response	Level of teaching assignment Elementary	Secondary	Subtotal	
A	140	89	229	
B,C,D	156	201	357	
Subtotal	296	290	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 16.971 X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

planning level. Calculated expectant frequencies indicated that 203 elementary and 199 secondary teachers should have preferred response A.

Expected frequencies (row subtotal x column subtotal ÷ grand total) indicated a similar result. One would expect fewer elementary and more secondary teachers to indicate a preference to become involved in planning of educational program policy. The expected frequencies in reference to data contained in Table 27 indicated that 115 elementary and 114 secondary teachers would in a normal distribution choose response A.

An inspection of Table 28 indicated that only 76 respondents chose item A. Response A was in reference to planning flexible scheduling. If a respondent chose item A

Table 28. Level of teaching assignment versus desire to participate in planning of educational program policy

Response	Level of teaching assignment Elementary	Secondary	Subtotal	
A	54	22	76	
B,C,D	242	268	510	
Subtotal	296	290	586	Total
Cal. X^2 = 14.739		X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635		

**.01 level of significance.

he would visit schools who had implemented flexible scheduling. Calculated frequencies revealed that 38 elementary and 38 secondary teachers should have chosen item A.

On the basis of respondents' choices the null hypothesis was rejected. There appeared to be a significant difference between level of teaching assignment and desire to participate in planning educational program policy. Fewer secondary teachers than expected expressed a desire to become involved in the planning level of program policy.

Hypothesis No. 20. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of grade level taught and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in implementing educational program policy.

Choice B of questions 1 thru 5 attempted to substantiate the validity of the null hypothesis. Questions 1 thru 4 revealed no significant differences between grade level taught and desire to become involved in implementing educational program policy.

Question 5 indicated a significant difference which is illustrated in Table 29.

Table 29. Level of teaching assignment versus desire to participate in implementing educational program policy

Response	Level of teaching assingment Elementary	Secondary	Subtotal	
B	132	92	224	
A,C,D	164	198	362	
Subtotal	296	290	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 10.276 X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

An evaluation of Table 29 indicated that the significant difference was attributable to a greater number of elementary and a fewer number of secondary teachers than expected who desired to participate in implementing educational program policy.

In general the null hypothesis was tenable. Few

significant differences could be found between grade level taught and desire to be involved in the implementation of educational program policy.

Hypothesis No. 21. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of grade level taught and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in evaluating educational program policy.

Questions 1 thru 5, item C, were designed to test the null hypothesis utilizing the chi-square test of dependence and independence. Response C of questions 3 and 5 indicated significant differences which are depicted in Tables 30 and 31.

Table 30. Level of teaching assignment versus desire to participate in evaluating educational program policy

Response	Level of teaching assignment Elementary	Secondary	Subtotal	
C	166	138	304	
A,B,D	130	152	282	
Subtotal	296	290	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 4.234$ X^2*, 1 d.f. = 3.841

*.05 level of significance.

An examination of Table 30 revealed a significant difference between elementary and secondary teachers at the .05 level. Calculated expected frequencies indicated to the investigator that 153 elementary and 151 secondary teachers would have normally been expected to respond to item C. Data presented illustrated that more elementary and fewer secondary teachers desired participation in evaluating educational program policy than anticipated.

Table 31 revealed the significant difference to be attributable to the large number of elementary teachers responding to item C. Fewer secondary teachers than expected indicated a desire to become involved in evaluating educational program policy.

Table 31. Level of teaching assignment versus desire to participate in evaluating educational program policy

Response	Level of teaching assignment Elementary	Secondary	Subtotal	
C	148	92	240	
A,B,D	148	198	346	
Subtotal	296	290	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 20.233$ X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

Respondents indicated no significant difference in terms of 3 of the 5 questions. Therefore, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis. Evidence presented suggested that level of teaching assignment was independent of desire to be involved in evaluating educational program policy.

Hypothesis No. 22. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of grade level taught and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in planning personnel policy.

Four of the 5 questions constructed to determine the validity of the null hypothesis resulted in significant differences. Questions 6, 7, 8, and 9 represented by Tables 32, 33, 34, and 35 illustrated a dependence of grade level taught and desire to participate in planning personnel policy.

An examination of Tables 32, 33, 34, and 35 revealed that a significant difference did exist between elementary and secondary teachers and their desire to participate in planning personnel policy. Fewer secondary teachers than expected expressed a desire to participate at .01 level of involvement. Conversely, more elementary teachers than expected expressed a desire to participate in planning personnel policy.

Question 10 did not reveal any measurable differences.

Table 32. Level of teaching assignment versus desire to participate in planning personnel policy

Response	Level of teaching assignment Elementary	Secondary	Subtotal	
A	157	113	270	
B,C,D	139	177	316	
Subtotal	296	290	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 11.680 X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

Table 33. Level of teaching assignment versus desire to participate in planning personnel policy

Response	Level of teaching assignment Elementary	Secondary	Subtotal	
A	212	166	378	
B,C,D	84	124	208	
Subtotal	296	290	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 12.230 X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

Results invalidated the null hypothesis in 4 of the 5 instances under investigation; consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected. Evidence indicated a difference

Table 34. Level of teaching assignment versus desire to participate in planning personnel policy

Response	Level of teaching assignment Elementary	Secondary	Subtotal	
A	207	169	376	
B,C,D	89	121	210	
Subtotal	296	290	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 8.656 X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

Table 35. Level of teaching assignment versus desire to participate in planning personnel policy

Response	Level of teaching assignment Elementary	Secondary	Subtotal	
A	173	114	287	
B,C,D	123	176	299	
Subtotal	296	290	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 21.464 X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

between elementary and secondary teachers and their desire to participate at the planning level of personnel policy. Fewer secondary teachers indicated a desire to participate than expected.

Hypothesis No. 23. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of grade level taught and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in implementing personnel policy.

Hypothesis no. 23 was tested in five instances. Four significant differences were discovered (see Tables 36, 37, 38, and 39).

Table 36. Level of teaching assignment versus desire to participate in implementing personnel policy

Response	Level of teaching assignment Elementary	Secondary	Subtotal	
B	200	127	327	
A,C,D	96	163	259	
Subtotal	296	290	586	Total
	Cal. X^2 = 33.571	X^2**, 1 d.f. 6.635		

**.01 level of significance.

An inspection of Tables 36, 37, 38, and 39 indicated that the statistical significant differences were attributable to the fewer than expected number of secondary teachers who desired to participate in implementing personnel policy. Using expected frequency techniques, more elementary teachers desired involvement than anticipated.

Question 10, item B, did not reveal any differences.

Table 37. Level of teaching assignment versus desire to participate in implementing personnel policy

Response	Level of teaching assignment Elementary	Secondary	Subtotal	
B	248	197	445	
A,C,D	48	93	141	
Subtotal	296	290	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 20.147$ X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

Table 38. Level of teaching assignment versus desire to participate in implementing personnel policy

Response	Level of teaching assignment Elementary	Secondary	Subtotal	
B	284	255	539	
A,C,D	12	35	47	
Subtotal	296	290	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 12.756$ X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

The null hypothesis was found untenable. Data indicated that a dependency between variables existed. The researcher discovered that fewer secondary and more elemen-

Table 39. Level of teaching assignment versus desire to participate in implementing personnel policy

Response	Level of teaching assignment Elementary	Secondary	Subtotal	
B	131	99	230	
A,C,D	165	191	356	
Subtotal	296	290	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 6.290$ X^2*, 1 d.f. = 3.841

*.05 level of significance.

tary teachers desired to participate in implementing personnel policy.

Hypothesis No. 24. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of grade level taught and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy.

Questions 6 thru 10, response C were employed to test the validity of the hypothesis. Four questions revealed differences (see Tables 40, 41, 42, and 43).

An analysis of Tables 40, 41, 42, and 43 indicated that teaching level did influence desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy. Each of the tables further substantiated previous findings: fewer secondary and more elementary teachers desired to become involved in evaluating

Table 40. Level of teaching assignment versus desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy

Response	Level of teaching assignment Elementary	Secondary	Subtotal	
C	208	134	342	
A,B,D	88	156	244	
Subtotal	296	290	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 34.905$ X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

Table 41. Level of teaching assignment versus desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy

Response	Level of teaching assignment Elementary	Secondary	Subtotal	
C	248	222	470	
A,B,D	48	68	116	
Subtotal	296	290	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 4.826$ X^2*, 1 d.f. = 3.841

*.05 level of significance.

personnel policy.

Question 7, item C, did not reveal any significant differences between teaching level and desire to participate

Table 42. Level of teaching assignment versus desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy

Response	Level of teaching assignment Elementary	Secondary	Subtotal	
C	265	223	488	
A,B,D	31	67	98	
Subtotal	296	290	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 16.780 X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

Table 43. Level of teaching assignment versus desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy

Response	Level of teaching assignment Elementary	Secondary	Subtotal	
C	143	116	259	
A,B,D	153	174	327	
Subtotal	296	290	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 4.102 X^2*, 1 d.f. = 3.841

*.05 level of significance.

in evaluating personnel policy.

Since 80 per cent of the questions designed to test the null hypothesis resulted in dependence of variables, the null hypothesis was rejected. Grade level taught did

influence desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy.

Hypothesis No. 25. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of number of teachers within a system and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in planning in educational program policy.

Since a relationship existed between the student enrollment of a school and the number of teachers employed, it was recommended by Department of Public Instruction officials to classify those teachers employed in schools with under 1,000 enrollment as one (1); those employed in school systems with under 3,000 enrollment as two (2); those employed in school systems with over 3,000 enrollment as three (3).

Response A of questions 1 thru 5 were constructed to test the tenability of hypothesis no. 25. Questions 1A and 3A indicated significant differences among the number of teachers within a school system and desire to be involved at the planning level of program policy (see Tables 44 and 45).

Tables 44 and 45 indicated significant differences due to the fewer than expected number of teachers who desired to be involved in planning program policy. Categories two (2) and three (3) in Table 45, for example,

Table 44. Number of teachers versus desire to participate in planning in program policy

Response	Number of teachers employed 1	2	3	Subtotal	
A	107	83	20	210	
B,C,D	149	166	61	376	
Subtotal	256	249	81	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 9.009 X^2*, 2 d.f. = 5.991

*.05 level of significance.

Table 45. Number of teachers versus desire to participate in planning in program policy

Response	Number of teachers employed 1	2	3	Subtotal	
A	116	85	28	229	
B,C,D	140	164	53	357	
Subtotal	256	249	81	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 7.426 X^2*, 2 d.f. = 5.991

*.05 level of significance.

could be expected to have 97 and 32 respondents represented. Since categories 2 and 3 refer to school systems with over 2,000 enrollment, data suggested that teachers in medium

and large schools may not desire to be involved in program policy decision-making on the planning level as much as could be expected.

Since only 2 of the questions resulted in significant differences, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Questions 2, 4, and 5 yielded no significant differences.

Number of teachers within a system did not appear, in general, to influence the desire to participate in planning of program policy.

Hypothesis No. 26. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of number of teachers within a system and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in implementing in educational program policy.

Response B of questions 1 thru 5 indicated teachers' desire to be involved in implementing program policy. Question 1B indicated a significant difference (see Table 46).

Recognizing a significant difference the researcher calculated the expectant frequencies per call. Response B, category (1), small school, should have been preferred by 41 respondents; category (2), medium-size school, should have been preferred by 40 teachers. Category (3), schools with over 3,000 enrollment should have been represented by only 15 respondents.

Table 46. Number of teachers versus desire to participate in implementing program policy

Response	Number of teachers employed 1	2	3	Subtotal	
B	32	37	27	96	
A,C,D	224	212	54	490	
Subtotal	256	249	81	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 20.229 X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

Response B of question 1 revealed the significant difference to be attributable to the larger than expected number of teachers in small and medium size schools who desired to be involved in the implementation level of educational program policy decision-making.

Four of the 5 questions yielded no significant differences. The null hypothesis was not rejected. Evidence suggested that size of school system had little influence upon teachers' desire to become involved in implementation of educational program policy.

Hypothesis No. 27. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of number of teachers within a system and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in evaluating in educational

program policy.

Questions 1 thru 5, response C were designed to test the validity of the null hypothesis. Only question 1 yielded results which were statistically significant (see Table 47).

Table 47. Number of teachers versus desire to participate in evaluating in educational program policy

Response	Number of teachers employed 1	2	3	Subtotal	
C	77	75	40	192	
A,B,D	179	174	41	394	
Subtotal	256	249	81	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 11.783 X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

An inspection of Table 47 indicated that more respondents (83) should have chosen item C from small school systems (1); 81 respondents should have chosen C from medium size schools (2); only 28 respondents could be expected to choose item C from among large schools (3). Thus the researcher concluded from Table 47 that possibly teachers in small and medium size schools did not participate on the variable being discussed as frequently as could normally be expected.

Questions 2, 3, 4, and 5 did not yield any significant value. Because responses to questions, in general, resulted in no significant values the null hypothesis was not rejected. Number of teachers employed within a school system did not influence the desire to participate in evaluating educational program policy.

Hypothesis No. 28. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of number of teachers within a system and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in planning in personnel policy.

Only 1 of the questions, 6A, yielded a significant value (see Table 48).

Table 48. Number of teachers versus desire to participate in planning in personnel policy

Response	Number of teachers employed 1	2	3	Subtotal	
A	124	97	49	270	
B,C,D	132	152	32	316	
Subtotal	256	249	81	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 12.432 X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

Calculating expected frequencies, Table 48 indicated an investigator could expect more teachers from medium size and large size schools to become involved in planning aspects of personnel policy.

Questions 7, 8, 9, and 10, response A, did not reveal any significant values.

The investigator discovered no trend concerning the variables under discussion. The null hypothesis was not rejected. The data indicated that number of teachers employed was independent of desire to participate in the planning stages of personnel policy.

Hypothesis No. 29. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of number of teachers within a system and on the criterion variable or desire to participate in implementation in personnel policy.

Response B for each of questions 6 thru 10 was constructed to determine the validity of the null hypothesis. Only question 9 revealed significant values (see Table 49).

Table 49 revealed to the researcher that more teachers could have been expected to respond favorably to item B from medium size school systems (2). The significant value was attributable to the few number of teachers in medium size schools who desired to participate in implementing personnel policy.

Table 49. Number of teachers versus desire to participate in implementing in personnel policy

Response	Number of teachers employed 1	2	3	Subtotal	
B	108	76	46	230	
A,C,D	148	173	35	356	
Subtotal	256	249	81	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 19.333 X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

Response B of questions 6, 7, 8, and 10 revealed no dependence among variables.

The null hypothesis was tenable. Findings indicated no difference between teachers in small, medium, and large schools and teacher desire to participate in personnel policy decision-making on the implementation level.

Hypothesis No. 30. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of number of teachers within a system and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in evaluation in personnel policy.

Response C of questions 6 thru 10 were designed to test the previously stated hypothesis. Of the 5 questions pertaining to personnel policy, 2 of them resulted in

significant findings (see Tables 50 and 51).

Calculated frequencies in reference to data presented in Table 50 indicated that more teachers from small school

Table 50. Number of teachers versus desire to participate in evaluating in personnel policy

Response	Number of teachers employed 1	2	3	Subtotal	
C	148	136	58	342	
A,B,D	108	113	23	244	
Subtotal	256	249	81	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 7.313$ X^2*, 2 d.f. = 5.991

*.05 level of significance.

Table 51. Number of teachers versus desire to participate in evaluating in personnel policy

Response	Number of teachers employed 1	2	3	Subtotal	
C	158	161	62	381	
A,B,D	98	88	19	205	
Subtotal	256	249	81	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 5.970$ X^2*, 2 d.f. = 5.991

*.05 level of significance.

systems (1) and medium size school systems (2) could be expected to be involved evaluating personnel policy. Conversely, fewer teachers from large school systems (3) could be expected to be involved in evaluating personnel policy.

Table 51 revealed findings similar to those found in Table 50. More teachers from small and medium size school systems, based upon the number of teachers employed, could have been expected to desire participation in the evaluation stage of personnel policy.

Questions 8, 9, and 10 revealed no significant differences.

Thus, no noticeable trend became apparent; consequently, the null hypothesis was not rejected. In general findings indicated that number of teachers employed had no influence upon desire to participate in evaluation of personnel policy.

Hypotheses Nos. 31 thru 36. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of membership in state and national associations and on the following criterion variables:

(31) desire to participate in planning in educational program policy,

(32) desire to participate in implementing educational program policy,

(33) desire to participate in evaluating educational program policy,

(34) desire to participate in planning personnel policy,

(35) desire to participate in implementing personnel policy,

(36) desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy.

Teachers were categorized into two groups: (1) members of local education associations and (2) unified (members of the L.E.A., I.S.E.A., and N.E.A.). Chi-square tests of the two categories were conducted upon items A, B, C, and D of questions 1 thru 10. No significant differences were discovered. Therefore hypotheses nos. 31 thru 36 were held tenable. Findings revealed that membership in local or unified professional organizations did not influence teachers' desire to participate in planning, implementation, and evaluation in terms of personnel policy or educational program policy.

Hypothesis No. 37. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of educational level and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in planning in educational program policy.

Educational level was categorized into three groups

for statistical purposes. Those respondents with a BA were coded as one (1); those with MA as two (2); those with MA plus as three (3).

Questions 1 thru 5, item A, were designed to test the validity of the null hypothesis under investigation. Questions 1, 2, and 3 revealed significant differences (see Tables 52, 53, and 54).

Table 52. Educational level of teachers versus desire to participate in planning in educational program policy

Response	Educational level of teachers BA	MA	MA plus	Subtotal	
A	190	15	5	210	
B,C,D	282	67	27	376	
Subtotal	472	82	32	586	Total
Cal. X^2 = 20.667			X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210		

**.01 level of significance.

An inspection of Table 52 revealed 472 respondents possessed a BA; 82 a MA; 32 MA and beyond. Utilizing the expected frequencies technique, the researcher discovered that those respondents with MA and MA plus did not desire to participate as frequently as could be expected. Expected frequencies indicated that 30 respondents with

Table 53. Educational level of teachers versus desire to participate in planning in educational program policy

Response	Educational level of teachers BA	MA	MA plus	Subtotal	
A	340	46	16	402	
B,C,D	132	36	16	184	
Subtotal	472	82	32	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 13.674 X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

Table 54. Educational level of teachers versus desire to participate in planning in educational program policy

Response	Educational level of teachers BA	MA	MA plus	Subtotal	
A	196	25	8	229	
B,C,D	276	57	24	357	
Subtotal	472	82	32	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 6.393 X^2*, 2 d.f. = 5.991

*.05 level of significance.

an MA could be expected to desire involvement. Similarly, 11 respondents with an MA plus could be expected to desire

participation in planning in terms of educational program policy.

As revealed in Table 52, Table 53 indicated to the investigator that a fewer number of teachers with MA and MA and beyond desired to be involved in planning stages of educational program policy decision-making.

An investigation of Table 54 concurred with results obtained from the previous two tables. In reference to Table 54 expected frequencies revealed that 32 respondents with an MA, and 13 respondents with an MA and beyond could be expected to desire involvement in planning of educational program policy.

Questions 4 and 5 revealed no significant differences. A trend was noted in terms of educational level versus desire to participate in planning in educational program policy. Since 3 of the 5 questions indicated a significant difference, the null hypothesis was rejected. Findings indicated that respondents with an MA and above did not desire to participate as extensively as expected.

Hypothesis No. 38. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of educational level and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in implementing in educational program policy.

Response B of questions 1 thru 5 tested the tenability

of the hypothesis investigated. Questions 2 and 5 revealed significant differences (see Tables 55 and 56).

Table 55. Educational level of teachers versus desire to participate in implementing in educational program policy

Response	Educational level of teachers BA	MA	MA plus	Subtotal	
B	212	28	7	247	
A,C,D	260	54	25	339	
Subtotal	472	82	32	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 9.029 X^2*, 2 d.f. = 5.991

*.05 level of significance.

Table 56. Educational level of teachers versus desire to participate in implementing in educational program policy

Response	Educational level of teachers BA	MA	MA plus	Subtotal	
B	194	19	11	224	
A,C,D	278	63	21	362	
Subtotal	472	82	32	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 9.725 X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

An analysis of Table 55 revealed to the investigator that the significant difference at the .05 level was due to the fewer than expected number of respondents with an MA or MA and beyond who desired to become involved at the implementation level of program policy. Calculated frequencies indicated that 34 respondents with an MA, and 15 who possessed MA plus could normally be expected to become involved in implementation of program policy.

Investigation of findings contained in Table 56 replicated findings obtained in prior tables. Those respondents with an MA and MA plus could be expected to desire more participation on the implementation level of program policy.

Questions 1, 3, and 4 indicated no statistical differences.

Since the majority of questions resulted in non-significant results, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Findings indicated some trend towards lack of desire to participate among MA and MA plus respondents. However, in general, there appeared to be little relationship between educational level and desire to become involved in implementing educational program policy.

Hypothesis No. 39. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of educational level and on the criterion variable of desire

to participate in evaluation of educational program policy.

Only question 5 resulted in findings which indicated dependence of educational level and desire to participate in evaluation of educational program policy (see Table 57).

Table 57. Educational level of teachers versus desire to participate in evaluation of educational program policy

Response	Educational level of teachers BA	MA	MA plus	Subtotal	
C	208	23	9	240	
A,B,D	264	59	23	346	
Subtotal	472	82	32	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 9.718$ X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

Results obtained from Table 57 replicated earlier findings. Through calculating expected frequencies, the investigator discovered that a fewer number of MA and MA and beyond respondents indicated a desire to participate in evaluation processes then would normally be expected.

Questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 revealed no significant differences. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Educational level of teachers appeared, on the basis of findings, not to influence desire to participate in

evaluation of educational program policy.

Hypothesis No. 40. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of educational level and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in planning in personnel policy.

All five questions designed to test the tenability of the hypothesis revealed significant differences (see Tables 58, 59, 60, 61, and 62).

Table 58. Educational level of teachers versus desire to participate in planning in personnel policy

Response	Educational level of teachers BA	MA	MA plus	Subtotal	
A	239	23	8	270	
B,C,D	233	59	24	316	
Subtotal	472	82	32	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 20.396$ X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

An investigation of data contained in Table 58 revealed that fewer respondents with an MA or above chose item A from question 6. The significant difference resulted from a lack of desire to participate in the planning level of personnel policy from respondents with an MA or above.

Table 59. Educational level of teachers versus desire to participate in planning in personnel policy

Response	Educational level of teachers BA	MA	MA plus	Subtotal	
A	319	44	15	378	
B,C,D	153	38	17	208	
Subtotal	472	82	32	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 10.513 X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

Table 60. Educational level of teachers versus desire to participate in planning in personnel policy

Response	Educational level of teachers BA	MA	MA plus	Subtotal	
A	314	43	19	376	
B,C,D	158	39	13	210	
Subtotal	472	82	32	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 6.366 X^2*, 2 d.f. = 5.991

*.05 level of significance.

Calculated expected frequencies (row subtotal x column subtotal ÷ grand total) revealed that fewer respondents with an MA and above desired participation. Expected fre-

quencies indicated that 52 teachers in category 2 (MA) could have been expected to desire involved in planning of personnel policy; similarly 22 could have been expected to be represented in category 3 (MA and beyond).

Results obtained from Table 60 replicated prior findings: fewer respondents with an MA and beyond desire participation in the planning stage of personnel policy.

Table 61. Educational level of teachers versus desire to participate in planning in personnel policy

Response	Educational level of teachers BA	MA	MA plus	Subtotal	
A	249	30	8	287	
B,C,D	223	52	24	299	
Subtotal	472	82	32	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 15.095 X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

An investigation of Tables 61 and 62 indicated similar characteristics of teachers with MA degrees and beyond as prior tables. Respondents with an MA or MA plus did not desire participation in personnel policy as much as could statistically be expected.

Since all five questions resulted in significant differences, the null hypothesis was rejected. Findings

Table 62. Educational level of teachers versus desire to participate in planning in personnel policy

Response	Educational level of teachers BA	MA	MA plus	Subtotal	
A	198	30	5	233	
B,C,D	274	52	27	353	
Subtotal	472	82	32	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 9.072$ X^2*, 2 d.f. = 5.991

*.05 level of significance.

indicated that desire to participate in terms of planning personnel policy was most welcomed by respondents with a BA and less welcomed by those who responded with an MA and above.

Hypothesis No. 41. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of educational level and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in implementing personnel policy.

Teachers surveyed who chose response B of questions 6 thru 10 indicated a desire to participate in implementing personnel policy. Questions 6, 7, 8, and 9 revealed significant differences (see Tables 63, 64, 65, and 66).

An investigation indicated that the significant difference was due to the fewer number of respondents with an

Table 63. Educational level of teachers versus desire to participate in implementing personnel policy

Response	Educational level of teachers BA	MA	MA plus	Subtotal	
B	287	29	11	327	
A,C,D	185	53	21	259	
Subtotal	472	82	32	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 24.633 X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

Table 64. Educational level of teachers versus desire to participate in implementing personnel policy

Response	Educational level of teachers BA	MA	MA plus	Subtotal	
B	373	53	19	445	
A,C,D	99	29	13	141	
Subtotal	472	82	32	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 13.001 X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

MA and MA plus who desired to participate in implementing personnel policy. Expected frequencies revealed that category 2 (MA) should have been represented by 45 respon-

dents; category 3 (MA plus) by 19 respondents.

An inspection of Table 64 again revealed that the significant difference was due to less than expected number of respondents with an MA or MA plus who desired to participate in implementing personnel policy.

Expected frequencies in reference to Table 65 indicated that fewer respondents with an MA or MA plus desired to participate in implementing personnel policy.

Table 65. Educational level of teachers versus desire to participate in implementing personnel policy

Response	Educational level of teachers BA	MA	MA plus	Subtotal	
B	388	63	19	470	
A,C,D	84	19	13	116	
Subtotal	472	82	32	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 10.521 X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

Results obtained from an analysis of Table 66 further substantiated earlier findings; namely, respondents with an MA and MA plus failed to indicate a significant desire to participate in implementing personnel policy. Calculated expected frequencies for Table 63 revealed that 65 teachers with an MA should have desired participation; 30 respondents

Table 66. Educational level of teachers versus desire to participate in implementing personnel policy

Response	Educational level of teachers BA	MA	MA plus	Subtotal	
B	405	58	25	488	
A,C,D	67	24	7	98	
Subtotal	472	82	32	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 12.043 X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

with an MA plus should have desired participation.

Question 10 did not yield any significant values.

Since 4 of the 5 questions resulted in significant differences among teachers with a BA, MA, and MA plus, the null hypothesis was rejected. Findings indicated a dependence between educational level and desire to participate in implementing personnel policy. Those respondents with an MA or above desired less participation than expected.

Hypothesis No. 42. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of educational level and on the criterion variable of desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy.

Item C of questions 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 were designed to determine if educational level was independent of desire

to participate in evaluating personnel policy. Questions 6, 8, 9, and 10 revealed through the use of chi-square that desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy was dependent upon educational level (see Tables 67, 68, 69, and 70).

Table 67. Educational level of teachers versus desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy

Response	Educational level of teachers BA	MA	MA plus	Subtotal	
C	302	25	15	342	
A,B,D	170	57	17	244	
Subtotal	472	82	32	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 34.092$ X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

An analysis of Tables 67 thru 70 revealed similar results as prior investigations in reference to educational level of teachers influencing desire to participate in decision-making. Each of the tables revealed through expected frequencies technique that more teachers with an MA and beyond could be expected to desire participation in evaluation of personnel policy.

Question 7, response C, revealed no significant values.

Table 68. Educational level of teachers versus desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy

Response	Educational level of teachers BA	MA	MA plus	Subtotal	
C	388	63	19	470	
A,B,D	84	19	13	116	
Subtotal	472	82	32	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 10.521 X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

Table 69. Educational level of teachers versus desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy

Response	Educational level of teachers BA	MA	MA plus	Subtotal	
C	405	58	25	488	
A,B,D	67	24	7	98	
Subtotal	472	82	32	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 12.043 X^2**, 2 d.f. = 9.210

**.01 level of significance.

The null hypothesis was rejected on the basis of the findings. Results indicated a relationship between educational level and desire to participate in evaluating

Table 70. Educational level of teachers versus desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy

Response	Educational level of teachers BA	MA	MA plus	Subtotal	
C	216	37	6	259	
A,B,D	256	45	26	327	
Subtotal	472	82	32	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 8.899$ X^2*, 2 d.f. = 5.991

*.05 level of significance.

personnel policy. Teachers with a BA desired more participation than those with additional education.

Hypotheses Nos. 43 thru 48. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of recency of educational training and on the following criterion variables:

(43) desire to participate in planning in educational program policy,

(44) desire to participate in implementing educational program policy,

(45) desire to participate in evaluating educational program policy,

(46) desire to participate in planning personnel policy,

(47) desire to participate in implementing personnel

policy,

(48) desire to participate in evaluating personnel policy.

Recency of educational training was divided into three categories. Category one was represented by those respondents who received educational training prior to 1950; category two, those who received college education prior to 1961; category three, those who received education from 1961 to 1971.

A total of 86 respondents received college training prior to 1950; 75 teachers received college education prior to 1961; 425 respondents received education from 1961-71.

Chi-square tests were conducted on each of the three categories in reference to items A, B, C, and D of all ten questions. No significant differences were discovered.

Hypotheses nos. 43 thru 48 were held tenable. Findings revealed that recency of educational training did not influence teachers' desire to participate in planning, implementation, and evaluation in terms of personnel policy or educational program policy.

Teachers and Willingness to Assume Responsibility for Decisions

Part II of the study attempted to determine if teachers were willing to assume responsibility for decisions in which they had been involved. A second aspect of this part of the study attempted to determine factors which could influence willingness to assume responsibility.

Part III of the questionnaire (see Appendix B) contained ten hypothetical situations designed to determine willingness to assume responsibility. Responses A and B represented a desire of teachers to be held accountable for decisions in which they had been involved. Response C represented a lack of willingness to assume responsibility. Item D (other) was individually assigned as willingness or nonwillingness on the basis of the written explanation by the respondent. Some responses were discarded due to the illogical nature of the reply.

Table 71 represents a breakdown of total respondents and their desire to assume responsibility for decision-making.

An analysis of Table 71 indicated that the total percentage of respondents willing to assume responsibility for educational decision-making was 71.2. An analysis of those respondents willing to assume responsibility in terms of questions 1 thru 5 pertaining to program policy was 72.8. An analysis of question 5 which related the problem of a textbook not being appropriate for the slow learner resulted in the greatest percentage of respondents being willing to assume responsibility (see Appendix B, Part III, question 5).

Questions 6 thru 10 were designed to measure willingness to assume responsibility in terms of personnel policy.

Table 71. Percentage and number of respondents indicating a desire to assume responsibility for decision-making by question

	Questions				
	1 Program policy	2 Program policy	3 Program policy	4 Program policy	5 Program policy
Number willing to assume responsibility	501	432	315	338	561
Number not willing to assume responsibility	85	154	270	248	25
Total	586	586	585	586	586
Percentage willing to assume responsibility	85	74	53	57	95

Table 71. (Continued)

	Questions 6 Personnel policy	7 Personnel policy	8 Personnel policy	9 Personnel policy	10 Personnel policy
Number willing to assume responsibility	220	471	325	541	503
Number not willing to assume responsibility	366	115	261	43	83
Total	586	586	586	584	586
Percentage willing to assume responsibility	37	80	54	92	85
				Total % willing	71.2

Respondents indicated a desire to assume responsibility 69.6 per cent in reference to questions 6 thru 10. Teachers showed the greatest tendency to assume responsibility in terms of questions related to laymen's complaints about teacher salaries (see Appendix B, Part III, questions 7 and 9). The least desire to assume responsibility was in reference to questions concerning establishment of a school calendar and ineffectiveness of classroom instruction (see Appendix B, Part III, questions 6 and 8).

While the hypotheses postulated in the first chapter attempted to analyze selected factors which may influence willingness of teachers to assume responsibility for decision-making results derived from Table 71 indicated that those teachers polled appeared willing to assume responsibility for decisions in 71.2 per cent of the instances examined.

Selected Factors Influencing Willingness to Assume Responsibility for Decisions

The eight factors cited in the Introduction were analyzed in terms of willingness to assume responsibility for educational decisions. Questions 1 thru 10 of Part III of the questionnaire were designed to test the validity of eight hypotheses which are stated later. Questions 1 thru 5 were representative of educational program policy decisions. Teachers were asked to assume that they had been represented

on each policy committee where the policies were made for each case described.

Hypothesis No. 1. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of age and on the criterion variable of willingness to assume responsibility for educational program policy decisions.

Responses A and B of questions 1 thru 5 were designed to test the validity of the null hypothesis. Chi-square tests were conducted on response A versus B,C,D, response B versus A,C,D. Each question necessitated two tests since responses A and B represented willingness to assume responsibility. Only one of the questions refuted the validity of the null hypothesis (see Table 72).

Table 72. Age versus willingness to assume responsibility for educational program policy

Response	Age 20-35	36-50	51 and older	Subtotal	
A	178	92	82	352	
B,C,D	95	84	55	234	
Subtotal	273	176	137	586	Total
Cal. X^2 = 7.461		X^2*, 2 d.f. = 5.991			

*.05 level of significance.

An inspection of Table 72 revealed that a total of 352 teachers checked response A which was indicative of willingness to assume responsibility. The investigator discovered that the significant difference revealed in Table 72 could be attributed to the fewer than expected number of teachers between ages of 36 and 51 and older who indicated willingness to assume responsibility.

Nine of the chi-square tests revealed no significant values. Therefore, the null hypothesis was held tenable. Findings revealed that age was independent of willingness to assume responsibility for educational program policy decisions. Willingness to assume responsibility for program policy decisions appeared not to be influenced by age of teachers.

Hypothesis No. 2. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of age and on the criterion variable of willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions.

Ten chi-square tests using response A versus B,C,D, and response B versus A,C,D revealed only one significant finding (see Table 73).

Table 73 represents the results of question 8 which asked choices relative to ineffectiveness of classroom instruction. Calculated expected frequencies indicated that more teachers between ages 20-35 and fewer older

Table 73. Age versus willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions

Response	Age 20-35	36-50	51 and older	Subtotal	
B	102	88	56	246	
A,C,D	171	88	81	340	
Subtotal	273	176	137	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 7.106$ X^2*, 2 d.f. = 5.991

*.05 level of significance.

teachers could have normally been expected to choose response B.

Nine of the chi-square tests proved no relationship between age categories and willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions.

On the basis of findings the null hypothesis was not rejected. There appeared no difference between age categories and the variable of willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions. Results of questionnaire replies revealed that teachers were willing to assume responsibility for decisions. Previously cited tables indicated that willingness to assume responsibility was not a characteristic of age categories.

Hypothesis No. 3. There is no significant difference

between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of sex and on the criterion variable of willingness to assume responsibility for educational program policy decisions.

Responses A and B of questions 1 thru 5 were tested using chi-square tests of significant resulting in ten measures of dependence and independence. Three of the tests indicated significant values (see Tables 74, 75, and 76).

Table 74. Sex versus willingness to assume responsibility for educational program policy decisions

Response	Sex: Male	Female	Subtotal	
A	12	63	75	
B,C,D	193	318	511	
Subtotal	205	381	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 13.621 X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

Expected frequencies in reference to Table 74 revealed that 26 males and 49 females could have normally been expected to choose response A. Thus, the number of males who were willing to assume responsibility for educational program policy decisions was less than expected.

Similar results can be ascertained from Table 75. Statistically an investigator would expect 86 males to

Table 75. Sex versus willingness to assume responsibility for educational program policy decisions

Response	Sex: Male	Female	Subtotal	
B	72	174	246	
A,C,D	133	207	340	
Subtotal	205	381	586	Total
Cal. X^2 = 6.088		X^2*, 1 d.f. = 3.841		

*.05 level of significance.

choose response B. Results indicated that males were less willing to assume responsibility than anticipated.

An examination of Table 76 revealed the significant

Table 76. Sex versus willingness to assume responsibility for educational program policy decisions

Response	Sex: Male	Female	Subtotal	
B	65	87	152	
A,C,D	140	294	434	
Subtotal	205	381	586	Total
Cal. X^2 = 5.462		X^2*, 1 d.f. = 3.841		

*.05 level of significance.

difference to be attributable to the fewer than expected number of male respondents who chose response B.

Since only 3 of the 10 tests revealed any significant differences, the null hypothesis was not rejected. The factor of sex did not influence willingness to assume responsibility for educational program policy. While three tests revealed a fewer than expected number of men who were willing to accept responsibility, little conclusive evidence refuted the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis No. 4. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of sex and on the criterion variable of willingness to assume responsibility for educational personnel policy decisions.

Chi-square tests were conducted of response A and response B of questions 6 thru 10. Two out of 10 tests indicated a significant difference between sexes and willingness to assume responsibility in terms of personnel policy decisions (see Tables 77 and 78).

Response A, indicative of willingness to assume responsibility, was chosen by 178 males. Calculated expected frequencies indicated that only 130 males should have chosen response A. Conversely 320 females should have responded favorably to item A. Thus, Table 77 indicated to the researcher that more males were willing to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions than expected.

Table 77. Sex versus willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions

Response	Sex: Male	Female	Subtotal	
A	178	272	450	
B,C,D	27	109	136	
Subtotal	205	381	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 17.824 X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

Results indicated that fewer females than expected were willing to assume responsibility.

Response B, which indicated a preference to assume responsibility was chosen by 44 males and 53 females as shown in Table 78. Expected frequencies revealed that 33 males should have responded favorably to item B; 64 females could have been expected to choose response B. Results indicated that more males were willing to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions than anticipated.

However, 8 of the 10 chi-square tests revealed no differences between sexes and willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions; therefore, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis. Willingness to be held accountable for personnel policy

Table 78. Sex versus willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions

Response	Sex: Male	Female	Subtotal	
B	44	53	97	
A,C,D	161	328	489	
Subtotal	205	381	586	Total
Cal. X^2 = 5.504		X^2*, 1 d.f. = 3.841		

*.05 level of significance.

decisions appeared independent of sex.

Hypothesis No. 5. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of grade level taught and on the criterion variable of willingness to assume responsibility for educational program policy decisions.

In only one instance significant differences were found (see Table 79).

An investigation of data contained in Table 79 revealed that a greater than expected number of elementary and fewer than expected number of secondary teachers were willing to assume responsibility for educational program policy decisions.

Since only one test of significance resulted in

Table 79. Level of teaching assignment versus willingness to assume responsibility for educational program policy decisions

Response	Level of teaching assignment Elementary	Secondary	Subtotal	
A	78	56	134	
B,C,D	218	234	452	
Subtotal	296	290	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 4.117$ X^2*, 1 d.f. = 3.841

*.05 level of significance.

significant findings, the null hypothesis was held tenable. Level of teaching assignment appeared not be related to willingness to assume responsibility.

Hypothesis No. 6. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of grade level taught and on the criterion variable of willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions.

Two of the 10 chi-square tests revealed significant differences (see Tables 80 and 81).

An inspection of Table 80 revealed that a greater number of elementary teachers than expected were willing to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions. Calculated expected frequencies revealed that 37 elementary

Table 80. Level of teaching assignment versus willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions

Response	Level of teaching assignment Elementary	Secondary	Subtotal	
A	53	22	75	
B,C,D	243	268	511	
Subtotal	296	290	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 13.976 X^2**, 1 d.f. = 6.635

**.01 level of significance.

and 38 secondary teachers should have responded favorably to item A.

An inspection of Table 81 revealed opposite findings

Table 81. Level of teaching assignment versus willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions

Response	Level of teaching assignment Elementary	Secondary	Subtotal	
B	179	201	380	
A,C,D	117	89	206	
Subtotal	296	290	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 5.019 X^2*, 1 d.f. = 3.841

*.05 level of significance.

of those found in previous tables. Calculated expected frequencies indicated that 192 elementary and 188 secondary teachers should have responded B. Hypothesis no. 6 was not rejected. Grade level did not influence willingness to assume responsibility. Little evidence was available to refute the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis No. 7. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of number of teachers within a system and on the criterion variable of willingness to assume responsibility for educational program policy decisions.

Chi-square tests were conducted on responses A and B of questions 1 thru 5. No significant differences were found. Results indicated that number of teachers employed within a school system had no influence upon willingness to assume responsibility for educational program policy decisions. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis No. 8. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of number of teachers within a system and on the criterion variable of willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions.

Ten chi-square tests were conducted which indicated no significant results; therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Data analyzed indicated no relationship

between number of teachers within a system and willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions.

Hypothesis No. 9. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of number of years within a school system and on the criterion variable of willingness to assume responsibility for educational program policy decisions.

Ten chi-square tests on responses A and B of questions 1 thru 5 revealed only one significant difference between number of years within a school system and willingness to assume responsibility for educational program policy decisions (see Table 82).

Table 82. Number of years within a school system and willingness to assume responsibility for educational program policy decisions

Response	No. of years within a school system 1-5	6-10	11 or more	Subtotal	
A	282	118	127	527	
B,C,D	37	12	10	59	
Subtotal	319	130	137	586	Total

Cal. $X^2 = 8.263$ X^2*, 2 d.f. = 5.991

*.05 level of significance.

At the .05 level, in reference to Table 82, a significant difference was noted. The difference was attributed

to the somewhat less than expected number of teachers with 1-5 years experience who were willing to assume responsibility. Calculated expected frequencies indicated that 286 teachers with 1-5 years experience could have been expected to choose response A. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis No. 10. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of number of years within a system and on the criterion variable of willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions.

A total of ten tests on responses A and B of questions 6 thru 10 revealed no significant differences; therefore, the null hypothesis was held tenable. The number of teachers within a system did not influence willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions in the investigation conducted.

Hypothesis No. 11. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of membership in professional associations and on the criterion variable of willingness to assume responsibility for educational program policy decisions.

Data collected revealed no significant differences between teachers categorized as members of the local education association and those who were members of the Iowa State and National Education Association and willing-

ness to assume responsibility for educational program policy decisions. Findings indicated that membership was an independent variable; consequently, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis No. 12. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of membership in professional associations and on the criterion variable of willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions.

Only 1 of the 10 tests conducted revealed a significant difference. A significant difference was found in reference to question 7 of the questionnaire (see Appendix B, Part III, question 7). Table 83 summarizes the results.

Table 83. Membership in professional associations versus willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy

Response	Membership in professional associations: Local	Unified	Subtotal	
B	5	15	20	
A,C,D	44	522	566	
Subtotal	49	537	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 7.481 X^2*, 1 d.f. = 3.841

*.05 level of significance.

The significant difference illustrated in Table 83 resulted from the fewer than expected number of teachers who were members of the local education association that chose response B. Sixteen members of the local association could have normally been expected to choose response B in reference to questionnaire item 7 of part III.

Hypothesis no. 12 was not rejected on the basis of findings. Data collected illustrated no difference between categories of membership in professional associations and willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions.

Hypothesis No. 13. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of educational level and on the criterion variable of willingness to assume responsibility for educational program policy decisions.

Ten chi-square tests revealed no significant difference between educational level when categorized by BA, MA, MA plus, and willingness to assume responsibility for educational program policy decisions. The null hypothesis was not rejected. Educational level appeared independent of willingness to assume responsibility.

Hypothesis No. 14. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of educational level and on the criterion variable of

willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions.

In only one of the tests was a significant difference discovered between educational levels and willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions.

An inspection of Table 84 indicated that the significant difference was due to the number of respondents with a BA who were willing to assume responsibility. Calculated expected frequencies revealed that 78 teachers with a BA could have normally chosen response B in reference to question 10.

Table 84. Educational level versus willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions

Response	Educational level BA	MA	MA plus	Subtotal	
B	73	13	11	97	
A,C,D	399	69	21	489	
Subtotal	472	82	32	586	Total

Cal. X^2 = 7.791 X^2*, 2 d.f. = 5.991

*.05 level of significance.

Since only 1 of the 10 tests indicated a significant difference between categories of educational level and willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy

decisions, the null hypothesis was not rejected. There appeared no difference between teachers with a BA, MA, or MA plus and willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy.

Hypothesis No. 15. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of recency of educational training and on the criterion variable of willingness to assume responsibility for educational program policy decisions.

Ten chi-square tests of responses A and B of questions 1 thru 5 revealed no significant differences between teachers surveyed who received degrees prior to 1950, 1951-61, and 1961-71 and willingness to assume responsibility for educational program policy decisions. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis No. 16. There is no significant difference between numbers of teachers when categorized on the basis of recency of educational training and on the criterion variable of willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions.

In reference to question 7 (see Appendix B, Part III, question 7), a significant difference was observed (see Table 85).

An inspection of Table 85 revealed on the basis of expected frequencies that the significant difference was

Table 85. Recency of educational training versus willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions

Response	Recency of educational training Before 1950	1951-61	1961-71	Subtotal
B	24	12	67	103
A,C,D	62	63	358	483
Subtotal	86	75	425	586 Total

Cal. $X^2 = 7.427$ X^2**, 2 d.f. = 5.991

**.01 level of significance.

due to the greater than expected number of teachers who received a degree prior to 1950 who were willing to assume responsibility.

Since only one test indicated some significant difference, the null hypothesis was not rejected. There appeared little relationship between categories of recency of educational training and willingness to assume responsibility for personnel policy decisions.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

During recent years teachers have become more actively involved in decision-making than their nineteenth-century counterparts could have envisioned.

A review of literature indicated that the previously mentioned trend toward staff involvement has coincided with the increased number of men in the profession, better educated teachers, increased strength of teacher organizations, more mobility of educators, and increased professionalism of teachers.

Although there was literature to support the claim that teachers desire a more active role, there was little evidence that revealed the factors that contribute to the desire to participate and also to the willingness to assume responsibility for decisions.

The purpose of this study was to determine selected factors which could influence teacher participation in decision-making and willingness to assume responsibility for decisions.

A total of 700 teachers were surveyed in Iowa during 1971. Questionnaire returns totaled 586 or 84 per cent.

Summary

Based upon statistical findings contained in the previous chapter, the following summary appeared

justifiable.

1. The factor of age categorization did not influence a teacher's desire to participate in decision-making at the planning, implementation, and evaluation levels of both personnel policy and educational program policy. While one could predict that with increased age a teacher desires to become more involved, the findings of the study did not indicate age to be related to involvement.

2. The factor of sex did influence teachers' desire to participate on the planning level of educational program policy. Three of the 5 chi-square tests indicated that women desired to participate on the planning level of program policy with greater frequency than men. Literature indicated men have become more anxious than women to have greater control over teaching conditions. Findings of the study in reference to planning program policy did not support such an assumption.

3. In terms of implementing program policy sex was not a factor. Women indicated as much desire as men to become involved in implementation aspects of program policy.

4. In terms of evaluation of program policy, men showed a greater desire than women. Women illustrated less desire to become involved in evaluation of scheduling, course content, and testing programs.

5. Sex appeared independent of desire to be involved in planning levels of personnel policy. No statistical difference was indicated between men and women in areas of salary, staff reduction, and in-service programs.

6. More females than males desired to be involved in implementation of personnel policy. Women were more willing to assist in developing in-service programs, teacher evaluation materials, etc. than men.

7. Involvement in evaluation of personnel policy was not influenced by sex.

8. Number of years within a school system did not influence desire to participate in planning, implementation, and evaluation stages of educational program policy. Little evidence was found to support claims that teachers with more experience are more willing to serve in capacities involving course content, grading, scheduling, and testing.

9. Number of years of service within a school did not influence desire to participate in planning and implementation levels of personnel policy.

10. Number of years of service within a school system did influence desire to become involved in evaluation of personnel policy. Teachers with 1-5 years of experience showed the greatest desire to be involved in evaluation of insurance programs, developing and reporting methods of staff elimination, and evaluation of teachers. Those

teachers with least experience appeared the most aggressive in terms of evaluating personnel policy.

11. Level of teaching assignment, elementary, or secondary, did influence desire to be involved in planning stages of educational program policy. Teachers of grades K-6 were more willing than secondary teachers to study testing programs, develop goals and objectives for courses, etc.

12. Level of teaching assignment did not, however, influence teachers' desire to become involved in implementation and evaluation levels of program policy.

13. More elementary teachers than secondary were willing to become involved in all facets of personnel policy. Since sex appeared independent of desire to be involved in planning and evaluation of personnel policy one cannot attribute the desire of elementary teachers to be involved in all facets of personnel policy to the large percentage of female elementary teachers.

14. Whether small, medium, or large, the size of school system did not influence teacher's desire to become involved in any levels of personnel policy or program policy. Evidence refuted some claims revealed in the Review of Literature that consolidation of school systems and increased bureaucracy prompted teacher participation in decision-making.

15. Membership in professional organizations did not influence decision-making at any of the levels of involvement in program policy or personnel policy. Much professional literature has related concepts of teacher involvement in decision-making. Findings indicated that whether a member of I.S.E.A. and N.E.A. versus local membership did not have any significant effect upon desire to be involved.

16. Educational level did influence desire to become involved in the planning stages of program policy. Data revealed that teachers with a bachelor's degree desired more participation than those more highly educated.

17. Some trend was noticed in terms of educational level and involvement in program policy at implementation and evaluation levels. However, in general, educational level did not influence involvement in implementation and evaluation of program policy.

18. Involvement at all three levels of personnel policy was influenced by educational level. Those respondents with a bachelor's degree desired more involvement than those teachers who had earned a master's degree or above. Possibly those teachers with an MA or above are more subject-matter oriented and not concerned with broad areas of personnel policy.

19. Recency of educational training did not influence

involvement of teachers in program policy or personnel policy at all levels of involvement. Whether a teacher received a degree prior to 1950, before 1961, or after 1961 did not have any significant effect upon tests conducted. If teacher militancy can be associated with the recent college graduate entering the education profession, the findings revealed that such militancy did not prompt desire for involvement in issue areas investigated.

20. Approximately 71 per cent of the respondents indicated willingness to be held responsible for decisions in the areas of personnel policy and educational program policy.

21. All of the chosen factors tested resulted in no significant differences. Sex, age, number of years within a school, grade level taught, size of school, professional association membership, and recency of educational training had no influence upon willingness to be held responsible for educational decisions.

Conclusions

The Review of Literature revealed several factors to which the use of teacher participation in decision-making has been attributed. Some of the most salient factors were tested by the researcher in the investigation under study. Out of eight chosen factors, none appeared significant in each test conducted. Two factors, educa-

tional level and grade level taught, were found to be significant in the majority of tests conducted.

Thus, it appeared to the investigator that no "particular" type of teacher was the most willing to participate in decision-making. Willingness to participate, therefore, cannot be dependent upon any of the common characteristics associated with teachers.

Since literature revealed that teachers desire participation, the researcher pursued the factor of willingness to assume responsibility. Findings indicated that teachers, at least those chosen for the study, were willing to assume responsibility for decisions. However, none of the characteristics tested indicated a relationship to willingness to be held responsible.

The researcher could not conclude from this study that the assumption that teachers do desire to participate in decision-making was invalid. One could only conclude that the factors analyzed did not contribute to involvement.

The results of this study reveal a need to re-examine the assumption that teachers desire to participate in decision-making.

Recommendations for Further Study

On the basis of the investigation conducted the researcher could not support nor disprove the assumption that teachers desire to participate in the educational

decision-making process. Therefore, the following recommendations for further study are submitted with the intention of providing a reference point for future investigations.

1. While literature reviewed indicated a desire of teachers to participate in decision-making, on the basis of the study the investigator remained dubious concerning the assumption. Further investigation of the assumption that teachers do desire to participate in decision-making could prove to be worthwhile.

2. Since the researcher failed, in general, to determine selected factors influencing decision-making, an investigation of other factors, such as teacher personality traits versus desire to participate in decision-making might be fruitful.

3. As a means of getting more specific information relative to teacher participation in decision-making, a fundamental research problem should be resolved: The data-seeking device should be so designed so that situations depicted could be assigned weights in relationship to the nature of the factor under consideration.

4. A comparative investigation of administrative styles of leadership versus teacher desire to participate in decision-making could provide pertinent information. Such questions as the following could provide useful

insight: Does an autocratic administrative style stimulate a greater desire on the part of teachers to participate in decision-making than a democratic administrative style or vice versa.

5. If the assumption that teachers do desire to participate is held tenable, a study of procedures utilized for effective teacher participation in decision-making should provide useful information. Answers to such questions as time of day for involvement in program policy decisions, hours of duty, etc. could be of assistance to teachers, administrators, and professional organizations.

6. Recent professional literature has focused upon the emergence of accountability in education. The assumption of responsibility for decisions needs to be investigated intensively.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adair, J. W. Keeping teachers happy. American School Board Journal 155: 28-29. January 1968.

2. Anderson, Lester W. and Lauren A. Van Dyke. Secondary school administration. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company. 1963.

3. Archambault, E. D. Teacher role in school policy development. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Iowa City, Iowa, Library, University of Iowa. 1967.

4. Bell, Lester. Teacher power; what it means. Grade Teacher 85: 75-92. May 1968.

5. Beaumont, A. E. Assessing the initial one and one-half years of a teacher counseling program in a senior high school. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. College Park, Maryland, Library, University of Maryland. 1961.

6. Bigger role for teachers? Majority endorses the idea. Nation's Schools 84: 25. December 1969.

7. Blumberg, Arthur, William Wayson, and Wilford Weber. Elementary school cabinet: the report of an experience in participative decision-making. Educational Administration Quarterly 5: 39-52. August 1969.

8. Bumbarger, Lester S. Differences in teacher and administrator perceptions of public school decision-making. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation. Eugene, Oregon, Library, University of Oregon. 1966.

9. Campbell, Roald F., John E. Corbally, and John A. Ramseyer. Introduction to school administration. Boston, Allyn and Bacon. 1966.

10. Carson, Robert B. Teacher participation in decision-making in education and other local community activities in three Oregon communities. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation. Eugene, Oregon, Library, University of Oregon. 1965.

11. Cochran, W. F. Sampling techniques. New York, New York, John Wiley and Sons. 1963.

12. Dawson, John E. New approaches to decision-making. The National Elementary Principal 47, No. 6: 62-66.

13. Doherty, Robert E. Impact of teacher organizations upon setting school policies. Clearing House 40, No. 9: 515. May 1966.

14. Fleishman, Edwin and Edwin F. Harris. Patterns of leadership behavior related to employee grievances and turnover. Personnel Psychology 15: 43-45. 1962.

15. Frey, Sherman H. Policy formulation--a plan involving teachers. Clearing House 44, No. 3: 259. January 1969.

16. Gifford, G. R. Relationship between participation in decision-making and two dimensions of teacher personality. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Eugene, Oregon, Library, University of Oregon. 1964.

17. Gordon, Thomas L. Group-centered leadership. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company. 1955.

18. Griffiths, Daniel E. Administrative theory. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. 1959.

19. Grimes, Robert. Structuring teachers into the decision-making process. Journal of Secondary Education 44, No. 8: 346. December 1969.

20. Harris, Ben H. Supervisory behavior in education. New Jersey, Prentice Hall. 1962.

21. Iowa. State Department of Public Instruction. Data on Iowa schools, school year 1969-70, professional personnel, public and non public. Part 2, Table 10, page 10.

22. Iowa State Educational Association Communique, Vol. 6. February 1969.

23. Iowa State Educational Association Communique, Vol. 8, No. 5. January 1971.

24. Johansen, John H. Relationships between teachers' perceptions of influence in local curriculum decision-making and curriculum implementation. Journal of Educational Research 61, No. 2: 81. October 1967.

25. Leiman, Harold I. Study of teacher attitude and morale as related to participation in administration. Dissertation Abstracts 23, No. 1: 509. 1962.

26. Lucio, William H. and John D. McNeil. Supervision: a synthesis of thought and action. New York, McGraw-Hill. 1962.

27. Lutz, Frank W. and Joseph Azzarelli. Struggle for power in education. New York, The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc. 1966.

28. Manning, William R. Negotiations: the process in collective bargaining. American School Board Journal 58: 14-15. August 1966.

29. Marshall, Marvin L. Focus on leadership in group decision making. The Clearing House 45, 41-44. September 1970.

30. McClurkin, W. D. School building planning. New York, The Macmillan Company. 1964.

31. Murray, Erskine S. Teachers and decision-making: their desire to participate and willingness to assume responsibility. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation. Auburn, Alabama, Library, Auburn University. 1969.

32. National Education Association, Research Division. [Table]. Today's Education 58: 6. April 1969.

33. Peterson, Fred. Views from the editor. Personnel Administration 25: 2. May-June 1966.

34. Pierce, Truman M. and A. D. Albright. Profession in transition. Baltimore, Maryland. The Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration and its successor, the Associated Programs in Educational Administration. P. 30. 1960.

35. Piner, Rex E. Descriptive analysis of professional negotiations agreement in the public school districts of Florida. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation. Gainesville, Florida, Library, Florida State University. 1967.

36. Popham, James W. Educational statistics--use and interpretation. New York, Harper and Row. 1967.

37. Section I. Article 5(13085), California Assembly Bill No. 1474, 1965.

38. Sharma, C. L. Who should make decisions? Administrator's Notebook 3: 1-4. April 1955.

39. Schmuck, Richard and Arthur Blumberg. Teacher participation in organizational decisions. National Association of Secondary Principals Bulletin 53: 89-105. October 1969.

40. Smith, William S. Group problem-solving through discussion. Kansas City, The Bobbs-Merrill Company. 1965.

41. Smittle, G. B. Study of the perceptions of teacher involvement in critical and routine decisions in selected Ohio schools. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Columbus, Ohio, Library, Ohio State University. 1962.

42. Southworth, William D. Teamwork is the answer. American School Board Journal 152: 65-66. September 1966.

43. Stangel, Donald J. Helping spend school dollars wisely. Today's Education 60: 38-39. January 1971.

44. Stinnett, T. M., Jack H. Kleinmann, and Martha L. Ware. Professional negotiations in public education. New York, The Macmillan Company. 1966.

45. Suzzelo, Henry. Rise of local school supervision in Massachusetts. New York, Teachers College of Columbia University. 1906.

46. Walters, Robert N. Analysis of the extent to which teachers participate in the administration of the public schools of Mississippi. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation. University, Mississippi, Library, University of Mississippi. 1967.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer is indebted to Dr. Ross Engel for his counsel and willingness to assist in the development of the study.

The writer wishes to pay tribute to Dr. Ray Bryan, Dr. Harold Dilts, Dr. Elmer Schwieder, and Dr. Clarence Bockhop, members of the writer's committee.

Finally, grateful recognition is afforded to the writer's wife, Mary, for her unceasing assistance and encouragement.

APPENDIX A. SELECTED SCHOOLS

Stratum 1

Cedar Valley Community
Dows Community
Fonda Community
Grand Community
Kanawha Community
Lohrville Community
Maxwell Community
New Providence Community
Palmer Consolidated
Van Meter Community

Stratum 2

Allison-Bristow Community
Bondurant-Farrar Community
Central Webster Community
Kingsley-Pierson Community
Springville Community

Stratum 3

Alta Community
Britt Communicty
Lake City Community
Madrid Community
North Central Community

Stratum 4

Adel Community
Belmond Community
Clarion Community
Nashua Community

Stratum 5

Eagle Grove Community
Jefferson Community
Nevada Community
North Fayette Community
Vinton Community

Stratum 6

Albia Community
Chariton Community
Estherville Community
New Hampton Community
Webster City Community

Stratum 7

Dubuque Community
Ft. Dodge Community
Marshalltown Community
Ottumwa Community
Urbandale Community

APPENDIX B. QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I

For the purposes of this study you are requested to furnish the following information about yourself. Check ( ) the appropriate space.

Age: 20-35 _____, 36-50 _____, 51 & older _____

Sex: Male _____, Female _____

Number of years in current school system: 1-5 _____, 6-10 _____, 11 or more _____

Level of major teaching assignment: Elementary (K-6) _____, Secondary (7-12) _____

Educational level: BA or BS _____, MA or MS _____, Beyond MA or MS _____

Year in which you reached educational level stated above: before 1950 _____, 1951-60 _____, 61-71 _____

Membership in professional associations: Local education association _____, ISEA _____, NEA _____, unified _____

PART II

Below are listed various hypothetical situations which have been chosen to determine teachers' desire to participate in educational decision-making. Please read each situation carefully and place an (X) on the blank or blanks which best describe what you would be willing to do under the circumstances described. You may place more than one (X) per situation. Assume that any course of action that you choose would be in addition to regular teaching load.

1. Assume that you are a teacher of reading and it has been agreed upon by yourself and other reading teachers that a new reading program is needed. In order to meet your objective you would be willing to:

   _____ (A) Convince the administration of the need by

doing research and evaluation of the current program. Propose a program based upon your findings.

_____ (B) Assist the administration in selecting appropriate textbooks, equipment, federal funds, selection of students, if the program were approved.

_____ (C) Be willing, after a year's operation, to help interpret tests to parents, administrators, and board of education as to the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the program.

_____ (D) None of the above.

2. Grading students on a satisfactory or unsatisfactory basis has been discussed by the faculty. You, as a teacher, believe the "S" and "U" basis is quite sound. The administration is also favorable to the idea. I, as a teacher, would be willing to assist the principal in terms of:

_____ (A) Visit professors at a nearby university to ascertain their viewpoints on the subject.

_____ (B) Help him explain the policy to parents at a PTA meeting.

_____ (C) Assist him in tracing the rate of achievement of those students involved in the program after one year's operation.

_____ (D) None of the above.

3. There is agreement among faculty that American Government should be a two semester course instead of a one semester course. In order to facilitate instituting the two semester course, you would be willing to:

_____ (A) Assist a committee with the development of goals and objectives for the course.

_____ (B) Help the administration in arranging the class schedule so that the course may be offered on a two semester basis.

_____ (C) Help with a testing program to measure the benefits of the course after a one year trial period.

_____ (D) None of the above.

4. Teachers, in general, agree that the current standardized testing program does not adequately measure student achievement in various curricular areas. Since being in agreement with teachers, you would be willing to:

_____ (A) Study the area of tests and measurements so that you may make suggestions as to alternatives

to the present program.

_____ (B) Plan a testing program for students in terms of types of tests to be administered, when administered, and to whom administered.

_____ (C) Conduct an evaluation of the new testing program after an experimental period, report findings to school officials.

_____ (D) None of the above.

5. The new design, flexible modular scheduling, has been discussed among teachers. Teachers and administrators initially favor the plan. As a teacher you would be willing to:

_____ (A) Visit schools who have implemented it; visit professors who advocate its usage.

_____ (B) Assist in planning the schedule to implement the plan.

_____ (C) Evaluate the plan after a year's operation and report results of the evaluation to the board of education.

_____ (D) None of the above.

6. The president of the local teachers' organization has suggested life insurance as an additional fringe benefit. You would be willing to:

_____ (A) Contact schools that already have a plan; contact insurance representatives to get an assessment of programs.

_____ (B) Attempt to determine a suitable plan and report your findings to teachers.

_____ (C) Report to the board of education as to the costs of the program to the taxpayers, advantages and disadvantages of the program.

_____ (D) None of the above.

7. The board of education has become displeased with the traditional lock-step salary schedule. As an alternative, they have devised a schedule based upon a flat amount to be divided among all teachers. You would be willing to:

_____ (A) Investigate and research how to divide the available money and propose a plan based upon your findings.

_____ (B) Explain your plan, its effects, etc., at a teachers' meeting.

_____ (C) Evaluate the plan through personal contact with teachers after one year's operation.
_____ (D) None of the above.

8. Your school system is suffering from a decline in enrollment. The board of education feels that a policy needs to be developed for elimination of staff members because of the decline. You would:

_____ (A) Be willing to serve on a fact-finding committee that has as its purpose the formulation of an elimination policy.
_____ (B) Be willing to spearhead a committee that results in determining which teachers will be eliminated.
_____ (C) Report the results of A and B above to a meeting of teachers so that they may evaluate the plan.
_____ (D) None of the above.

9. The board of education has terminated a contract of a teacher for supposed incompetency. Considerable teacher feedback has resulted in a board of education proposal that new evaluation techniques need be devised. You would:

_____ (A) Be willing to assist in developing criteria for evaluation by reviewing research, contact schools for plans, seek out teacher and administrator viewpoints.
_____ (B) Assist in developing an evaluation sheet to be used for future evaluations, present it to teachers, administrators, and board of education.
_____ (C) Evaluate teachers on the basis of the new criteria, report findings to administration, teachers evaluated, board of education.
_____ (D) None of the above.

10. In your school system the traditional in-service program for teachers has become ineffective. The administration, teachers, and board of education feel that a new program need be instituted. You would be willing to:

_____ (A) Compare your systems' in-service program with that of other systems by means of a questionnaire, visitation, etc., to ascertain new approaches that could be taken.
_____ (B) Assist in the implementation of a new program in terms of getting speakers, setting a schedule, time, place, etc.

_____ (C) Sample teacher opinion of the new program after it has been in operation and report your findings to the administration.
_____ (D) None of the above.

PART III

Instructions: In this section you are again given several hypothetical situations. Assume that you are the teacher involved in each case and further assume that you and fellow teachers have been represented on each policy committee where the policies were made for each case described. You are given four courses of action in each case. Please indicate your first choice of a course of action by placing an (X) on the blank before the appropriate statement. If none of the statements is your first choice of a course of action, place an (X) on the line next to "other". Only one (X) per situation.

1. A parent complains to you that grading policies favor students from higher socio-economic levels. You would:

_____ (A) Discuss with him your viewpoints and attempt to reach a mutual agreement.
_____ (B) Tell the parent that you will bring the issue to the attention of the appropriate committee or entire faculty.
_____ (C) Tell the parent that his point may be well taken, but the administration and board of education are the final determining bodies to initiate policy decisions in such cases.
_____ (D) Other (explain) _____
_____

2. You have been in agreement with the principal that teacher aides are useful and effective. While attending a PTA meeting, an irate taxpayer complains to the principal during an open discussion period that teachers could assume the duties of the aides thus saving money. You would:

_____ (A) Ask if you could make additional supporting statements in addition to those made by the principal.
_____ (B) Allow the principal to reply to the charge but attempt to discuss the issue with the taxpayer privately.

_____ (C) Suggest to the irate citizen that possibly the best source to hear his complaint would be the board of education since they were the body who officially adopted a policy of employing aides.

_____ (D) Other (explain) _____

_____

3. After reviewing, updating, and publishing a new science curriculum, a local conservationist approaches you somewhat irritated in that no instruction on pollution will be offered. You would:

_____ (A) Discuss with him the reasons felt by the committee for elimination of pollution from the curriculum.

_____ (B) Tell him that his complaint will be discussed at the next curriculum meeting.

_____ (C) Arrange a meeting between the conservationist and the chairman of the science department or the principal involved.

_____ (D) Other (explain) _____

_____

4. A new policy of student discipline has been effected which was the result of a teacher committee. While teaching, you slap a student who has become disruptive, which results in his mother coming to you complaining. You would:

_____ (A) Tell her the nature of the child's disruption, your reasons for slapping him, and the policy resolution of the teacher's committee.

_____ (B) Point out that your action was justifiable, but that a review of corporal punishment by the committee which instituted the policy will be conducted.

_____ (C) Give the mother your explanation for slapping the child and refer her to the principal if she is not satisfied.

_____ (D) Other (explain) _____

_____

5. Being a member of the textbook selection committee, you have felt that a text chosen is excellent. A parent complains that the book is designated for the academically talented and does not provide adequate instruction for the slow learner. You would:

_____ (A) Discuss with the person tactfully that the text had been chosen considering all students of

various abilities in addition to teacher preference.

_____ (B) Relate that the matter will be discussed among proper committee members.

_____ (C) Tell the person that final authorization for textbook selection and purchase is an administrative responsibility; consequently, arrange a meeting between the parent and the administration.

_____ (D) Other (explain) _____

_____

6. As a member of the school calendar committee your proposal relative to starting fall classes 7 days earlier than usual is adopted. Several months later, during the summer, a local minister confronts you complaining that the opening day of school coincides with a junior-high church camp. You would:

_____ (A) Point out to him the problems encountered in establishing a calendar.

_____ (B) Acquire names of those students who desire to attend church camp, attempt to influence the principal to excuse them.

_____ (C) Have the problem referred to the administration so that it could be decided by proper school officials.

_____ (D) Other (explain) _____

_____

7. Teachers, administrators, and board of education have cooperatively developed a salary schedule. With quick board adoption, the policy has pleased personnel. At a church meeting, a person complains that the salary increases will result in a substantial increase in property taxes. You would:

_____ (A) Attempt to explain the necessity and benefits of an adequate salary schedule.

_____ (B) Tell the person that you will take his complaint to the salary committee.

_____ (C) Refer the irate person to a member(s) of the board of education.

_____ (D) Other (explain) _____

_____

8. A group of parents complain to you concerning the ineffectiveness of a classroom teacher. You would:

_____ (A) Point out the difficulty of teacher evaluations.

_____ (B) Suggest that the parents consult the teacher involved.

_____ (C) Point out that in the final analysis teacher evaluation is a responsibility of the administration and board of education; consequently, the complaint should be referred to these two bodies.

_____ (D) Other (explain) _____

_____

9. After successfully spearheading a committee to improve extra pay for extra duties, which was rapidly approved by the board of education, a parent complains to you that coaches are overpaid. You would:

_____ (A) Relate the nature of how the extra duty schedule was derived; point out the responsibility and hours of extra work involved in coaching,

_____ (B) Tell the person that as a member of the committee you will certainly take the viewpoint into consideration when the schedule is again evaluated.

_____ (C) Point out the rapidity with which the board of education approved the schedule and arrange for the person to contact a board of education member.

_____ (D) Other (explain) _____

_____

10. A state legislative committee has proposed requiring teachers to acquire 6 hours of graduate credit every two years to meet certification requirements. Being opposed to the proposal, you would:

_____ (A) Contact your representative personally or by letter.

_____ (B) Contact the local welfare committee and offer assistance to thwart the legislative aim.

_____ (C) Leave the matter up to the board of education and superintendent since such personnel possess necessary expertise in dealing with such situations.

_____ (D) Other (explain) _____

_____

APPENDIX C. LETTER TO ADMINISTRATORS

Stratford Community School

PHONE 515-838-2208 P. O. BOX 188

SUPERINTENDENT
Daniel M. Lynch

HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL
Clarence Devine

GRADE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL
Al Delay

BOARD MEMBERS
Jean Ahrens
Phillip Carroll
Vincel Crim
Jerry Galloway, President
Raymond Lavrenz

SCHOOL SECRETARY
Patricia Tuel

SCHOOL TREASURER
Alf Lee

Stratford, Iowa 50249

Dear Administrator:

I am conducting a study in conjunction with Dr. Ross Engel of Iowa State University designed to measure teachers' desire to participate in educational decision-making. The study is further designed to determine teachers' willingness to assume responsibility for educational decisions.

I am asking that you distribute _____ copies to _____ elementary teachers of grades K-6, and _____ copies to secondary teachers of grades 7-12.

Attached to the instructions of each questionnaire is a short note urging teachers to return the completed questionnaires to you for mailing.

After teacher completion, would you please place the completed questionnaires in the enclosed self-addressed envelope?

Since the results of this study will constitute a large portion of my Ph.D. dissertation, I desire 100 per cent return.

Please allow me to thank you in advance for your fine cooperation.

Sincerely,

Daniel M. Lynch
Superintendent
Stratford Community School